

Sophia Aneziri

Greek Endowments in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods

HABES

Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge | 69

Franz Steiner Verlag





H A B E S

Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien

Begründet von Géza Alföldy

Herausgegeben von Angelos Chaniotis und Christian Witschel

Beirat: François Bérard, Kostas Buraselis, Lucas de Blois, Ségolène Demougin,
Elio Lo Cascio, Mischa Meier, Elizabeth Meyer, Michael Peachin, Henk Versnel
und Martin Zimmermann

Band 69

www.steiner-verlag.de/brand/HABES

Greek Endowments
in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods

Sophia Aneziri

Franz Steiner Verlag

Published with the support of the National and Kapodistrian University
of Athens.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek:
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen
Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über
dnb.d-nb.de abrufbar.

Dieses Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes
ist unzulässig und strafbar.

© Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2025
Maybachstraße 8, 70469 Stuttgart
service@steiner-verlag.de
www.steiner-verlag.de

Druck: Beltz Grafische Betriebe, Bad Langensalza
Gedruckt auf säurefreiem, alterungsbeständigem Papier.

Printed in Germany.

ISBN 978-3-515-13916-8 (Print)
ISBN 978-3-515-13918-2 (E-Book)
DOI 10.25162/9783515139182

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS	9
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	15
INTRODUCTION	17

PART I

CHAPTER 1

REDEFINING THE ENDOWMENTS	21
1.1. The research to date	21
1.2. The evidence	23
1.3. Questions and methodological approach	25
1.4. Problems of terminology	26
1.5. Clarifying the components of a hybrid structure	29
1.5.1. Legal characteristics	29
1.5.2. Administrative framework	35
1.5.3. Financial characteristics	36

CHAPTER 2

SETTING UP AN ENDOWMENT:

PRINCIPLES OF ADMINISTRATION	41
2.1. The recipient and administrator	42
2.2. Administration of the endowments	47
2.2.1. Administration in the framework of a civic or sacred community	48
2.2.1.1. <i>Application of laws</i>	48
2.2.1.2. <i>Role of the council</i>	49
2.2.1.3. <i>City magistrates and public banks</i>	50
2.2.1.4. <i>Special magistrates</i>	52
2.2.2. Administration in the framework of an association	55
2.3. Protecting endowments	58
2.3.1. The risks	58
2.3.2. Protection mechanisms	62
2.3.2.1. <i>Cancellation – Penalties – Fines</i>	63
2.3.2.2. <i>Legal tools for the collection of debts and fines</i>	65
2.3.2.3. <i>Specific clauses concerning magistrates who violate the rules</i>	67
2.3.2.4. <i>Divine protection</i>	70

CHAPTER 3

RUNNING AN ENDOWMENT: FINANCIAL ASPECTS. 73

3.1. Nature and size of the gifts – forms and practices of investment	73
3.1.1. Land or money?	77
3.1.2. Which currency?	81
3.1.3. Interest rates	85
3.2. Overt and hidden benefits	86
3.2.1. The endowment of Kritolaos (cat. no. 27)	89
3.2.2. The endowment of Aristomenes and Psylla (cat. no. 26)	93
3.2.3. The endowment of Attalos II (cat. no. 22a+b)	94
3.3. To give or not to give? Postponing or avoiding?	96

CHAPTER 4

WHY ENDOWMENTS? THE SOCIO-POLITICAL CONTEXT 101

4.1. Who: profile and status of the endowers.	101
4.2. Endowments by women	107
4.3. For what purpose?	108
4.3.1. Self-related endowments	109
4.3.2. Endowments in the public interest.	111
4.4. <i>Cui bono?</i>	115
4.4.1. The community	116
4.4.2. The individual	121

CHAPTER 5

THE ROYAL ENDOWMENTS 127

5.1. Outside the kingdom.	127
5.1.1. Achaian League – Eumenes II (cat. no. 3)	127
5.1.2. Thespiai – Philetairos / Ptolemy IV (cat. nos. 14, 18)	129
5.1.3. Delphi – Eumenes II / Attalos II (cat. nos. 21a+b, 22a+b)	131
5.1.4. Delos – Ptolemies/Antigonids/Attalids (cat. nos. 34–47)	133
5.1.5. Rhodes – Eumenes II (cat. no. 66).	137
5.1.6. Chios – Attalos I or II (cat. no. 67a+b).	139
5.1.7. Miletos – Antiochos, son of Seleukos I / Eumenes II (cat. nos. 81, 83)	140
5.1.8. Kyzikos – Philetairos (cat. no. 89a+b)	141
5.2. Inside the kingdom.	142

5.2.1. Pergamon – Attalos I (cat. no. 90)	142
5.2.2. Baitokaike – Antiochos (cat. no. 98)	143
5.2.3. Kommagene – Antiochos I (cat. nos. 99, 100).	144

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS	147
-----------------------	-----

APPENDIX I

ERRONEOUSLY CLASSIFIED CASES – <i>FALSA</i>	157
---	-----

I.1. Testaments of philosophers	157
I.1.a. Testament of Theophrastos.	157
I.1.b. Testament of LykonI.1.b. Testament of Lykon	158
I.1.c. Testament of Epikouros.	158
I.2. Dedication of income to pay for sacrifices to Ptolemy III, Berenike II and the Dioskouroi	161
I.3. Funding for the birthday of Eumenes II	162
I.4. Funding of sacrifices and oil for soldiers in Thera by Ptolemy VI	165
I.5. Sulla's grant of land to the sanctuary of Amphiaraios at Oropos.	167

APPENDIX II

THE LIMITATIONS OF THE SOURCES:

UNCERTAINTIES AND PROBABILITIES	169
---	-----

II.1. The financial support of offices by their holders	170
II.2. Dedications of land	172
II.2.1. The <i>horoi</i> of sacred land	173
II.2.2. Ambiguous wordings in leases of sacred land at Thespiiai	178

TABLES.	181
-----------------	-----

Table 1. The endowers	181
Table 2. Recipients/administrators of endowments.	184
Table 3. Nature and size of the endowments	187
Table 4. Purposes of the endowments	190
Table 5. Endowments in chronological order	191

GRAPHS	195
------------------	-----

PART II

CATALOGUE OF EPIGRAPHIC AND LITERARY SOURCES	201
I. ATTIKA.	209
II. PELOPONNESE AND ARGOSARONIC ISLANDS	216
III. BOIOTIA – MEGARIS.	233
IV. PHOKIS.	251
V. LOKRIS.	265
VI. THESSALY	267
VII. IONIAN ISLANDS	271
VIII. AEGEAN ISLANDS	278
VIII.1. Kyklades (except Delos)	278
VIII.2. Delos.	310
VIII.3. Southern Sporades	351
VIII.4. Eastern Aegean Islands	369
IX. EUBOIA	378
X. ASIA MINOR.	384
X.1. Aiolis	384
X.2. Karia	389
X.3. Ionia	405
X.4. Lykia	423
X.5. Mysia	436
X.6. Phrygia	443
X.7. Troas	445
XI. EUXEINOS PONTOS	451
XII. SYRIA.	455
XIII. KOMMAGENE.	458
XIV. EGYPT	465
<i>DUBIA</i>	471
BIBLIOGRAPHY	483
INDICES	517
I. Name index.	517
II. Selected topics.	527
III. Important Greek words	542
IV. Source index	549
CONCORDANCES	555

ABBREVIATIONS

For literary texts I use the abbreviations given in *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. For the inscriptions I follow the *Abbreviations of Editions and Works of Reference for Alphabetic Greek Epigraphy* published on the website of the *International Association of Greek and Latin Epigraphy (AIEGL)*. For ease of reference, the abbreviations used are listed here.

<i>Agora XIX</i> =	G.V. Lalonde and M.B. Walbank, <i>The Athenian Agora, XIX. Inscriptions. Horoi, Poletai, Leases of Public Lands</i> , Princeton 1991.
<i>Agora XXI</i> =	M. Lang, <i>The Athenian Agora, XXI. Graffiti and Dipinti</i> , Princeton 1976.
<i>AGRW</i> =	P. Harland, <i>Associations in the Greco-Roman World</i> , Toronto (https://www.philipharland.com/greco-roman-associations).
<i>Anthologio</i> 2018 =	S. Aneziri (ed.), <i>Ανθολόγιο. Επιλογή επιγραφών και παπύρων της ελληνιστικής και ρωμαϊκής περιόδου</i> , Athens 2018.
<i>BE</i> =	<i>Bulletin épigraphique</i> in <i>Revue des études grecques</i> , Paris 1888–.
Brodersen, <i>HGIU</i> =	H. Brodersen, W. Günther and H.H. Schmitt, <i>Historische Griechische Inschriften in Übersetzung, I–III</i> , Darmstadt 1992–1999.
<i>CAP</i> =	<i>Copenhagen Association Project. Inventory</i> , Copenhagen (https://ancientassociations.ku.dk/CAP).
Cauer, <i>Delectus</i> =	P. Cauer, <i>Delectus Inscriptionum Graecarum propter dialectum memorabilitum</i> , 2 nd edition, Lipsiae 1877.
<i>Choix Délos I</i> =	F. Durrbach, <i>Choix d'inscriptions de Délos avec traduction et commentaire. I. Textes historiques</i> , Paris 1921–1923.
<i>Choix Délos II</i> =	C. Prêtre et al., <i>Nouveau choix d'inscriptions de Délos. Lois, comptes et inventaires (Études épigraphiques, 4)</i> , Paris 2002.
<i>Choix Delphes</i> =	A. Jacquemin, D. Mulliez and G. Rougemont, <i>Choix d'inscriptions de Delphes traduites et commentées (Études Épigraphiques, 5)</i> , Paris 2012.
<i>Choix Syrie</i> =	J.-B. Yon and P.L. Gatier, <i>Choix d'inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie</i> , Beirut 2009.
<i>CIG</i> =	A. Boeckh, <i>Corpus inscriptionum Graecarum, I–IV</i> , Berlin 1828–1877.
<i>CIL</i> =	<i>Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum</i> , Berlin 1863–.
<i>Dial. graec. ex.</i> =	E. Schwyzler, <i>Dialectorum Graecarum exempla epigraphica potiora</i> , Leipzig 1923.
<i>Greek Ritual Norms</i> =	J.-M. Carbon, S. Peels and V. Pirenne-Delforge, <i>A Collection of Greek Ritual Norms</i> , Liège 2017 (https://cgrn.ulg.ac.be).
<i>EBGR</i> =	A. Chaniotis et al., <i>Epigraphic Bulletin for Greek Religion in Kernos</i> .
<i>F.Delphes III</i> =	<i>Fouilles de Delphes, III. Épigraphie</i> , Paris 1909–1985.
Guarducci, <i>EG</i> =	M. Guarducci, <i>Epigrafia greca, I–IV</i> , Rome 1967–1978.

Hellmann, <i>Choix architect.</i> =	M.-C. Hellmann, <i>Choix d'inscriptions architecturales grecques traduites et commentées</i> , Lyon 1999.
Herzog, <i>KFF</i> =	R. Herzog, <i>Koische Forschungen und Funde</i> , Leipzig 1899 (reprinted in <i>Subsidia Epigraphica</i> , Hildesheim/Zürich/New York 1983).
<i>I.Ano Maked.</i> =	A. Rizakis and G. Touratsoglou, <i>Επιγραφές Άνω Μακεδονίας (Ελίμεια, Εορδαία, Νότια Ανγκηστίς, Ορεστίς)</i> , <i>I. Κατάλογος επιγραφών</i> , Athens 1985.
<i>I.Aphrodisias and Rome</i> =	J. Reynolds, <i>Aphrodisias and Rome: documents from the excavation of the theatre at Aphrodisias conducted by Professor Kenan T. Erim, together with some related texts</i> , London 1982.
<i>I.Aphrodisias 2007</i> =	J. Reynolds, C. Roueché and G. Bodard, <i>Inscriptions of Aphrodisias</i> , 2007 (https://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/iaph2007).
<i>I.Beroia</i> =	L. Gounaropoulou and M.B. Hatzopoulos, <i>Επιγραφές Κάτω Μακεδονίας, I. Επιγραφές Βέροιας</i> , Athens 1998.
<i>I.British Mus.</i> =	G. Hirschfeld and F.H. Marshall, <i>The Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum</i> , Oxford 1874–1916.
<i>I.Byzantion</i> =	A. Łajtar, <i>Die Inschriften von Byzantion</i> , I (<i>Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien</i> , 58), Bonn 2000.
<i>I.Cos Paton</i> =	W.R. Paton and E.L. Hicks, <i>The Inscriptions of Cos</i> , Oxford 1891.
<i>I.Cos Segre</i> =	M. Segre, <i>Iscrizioni di Cos</i> , I–III (<i>Monografie della Scuola Archeologica di Atene</i> , 6), Rome 1993.
<i>I.Cret.</i> =	M. Guarducci, <i>Inscriptiones Creticae</i> , I–IV, Rome 1935–1950.
<i>I.Délos</i> =	F. Durrbach, <i>Inscriptions de Délos</i> , I–VII, Paris 1926–1972.
<i>I.Delphinion</i> =	G. Kawerau and A. Rehm, <i>Das Delphinion in Milet (Milet. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen seit dem Jahre 1899</i> , I 3), Berlin 1914.
<i>I.Delta</i> =	A. Bernand, <i>Le Delta égyptien d'après les textes grecs 1. Les confins libyques (Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale</i> , 91), Cairo 1970.
<i>I.Didyma</i> =	A. Rehm, <i>Didyma</i> , II. <i>Die Inschriften</i> , Berlin 1958.
<i>I.Egypte prose</i> =	A. Bernand, <i>La Prose sur pierre dans l'Égypte hellénistique et romaine</i> , I–II, Paris 1992.
<i>I.Eleusis</i> =	K. Clinton, <i>Eleusis. The Inscriptions on Stone. Documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and Public Documents of the Deme</i> , vols. IA, IB, II, Athens 2005–2008.
<i>I.Ephesos</i> =	H. Wankel, R. Merkelbach et al., <i>Die Inschriften von Ephesos</i> , I–VIII (<i>Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien</i> , 11,1–17,4), Bonn 1979–1984.
<i>I.Estremo Oriente</i> =	F. Canali De Rossi, <i>Iscrizioni delle Estremo Oriente Greco. Un repertorio (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien</i> , 65), Bonn 2004.
<i>IG</i> =	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i> , Berlin 1873–.
<i>IGLS VII</i> =	J.-P. Rey-Coquais, <i>Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie. Arados et régions voisines</i> , Paris 1970.
<i>IGR</i> =	R. Cagnat et al., <i>Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes</i> , Paris 1906–1927.
<i>I.Hierapolis Judeich</i> =	W. Judeich, <i>Inschriften</i> , in C. Humann et al. (eds.), <i>Altertümer von Hierapolis (Jahrbuch des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Ergänzungsheft</i> , 4), Berlin 1898, 67–202.

<i>I.Histria</i> =	D.M. Pippidi, <i>Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris Graecae et Latinae, I. Inscriptiones Histriae et vicinae</i> , Bucharest 1983.
<i>I.Iasos</i> =	W. Blümel, <i>Die Inschriften von Iasos, I–II (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 28)</i> , Bonn 1985.
<i>I.Ilion</i> =	P. Frisch, <i>Die Inschriften von Ilion (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 3)</i> , Bonn 1975.
<i>I.jur.gr.</i> =	R. Dareste, B. Haussoulier and T. Reinach, <i>Recueil des Inscriptions juridiques grecques</i> , Paris 1894–1904.
<i>I.Kos Heilige Gesetze</i> =	R. Herzog, <i>Heilige Gesetze von Kos (Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, philosophisch-historische Klasse, 6)</i> , Berlin 1928.
<i>I.Kyme</i> =	H. Engelmann, <i>Die Inschriften von Kyme (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 5)</i> , Bonn 1976.
<i>I.Labraunda</i> =	J. Crampa, <i>Labraunda. Swedish Excavations and Researches, III. Greek Inscriptions, I–II</i> , Lund 1969/Stockholm 1972.
<i>I.Lampsakos</i> =	P. Frisch, <i>Die Inschriften von Lampsakos (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 6)</i> , Bonn 1978.
<i>I.Lindos</i> =	C. Blinkenberg, <i>Lindos. Fouilles et recherches, 1902–1914, II. Fouilles de l'acropole. Inscriptions, I–II</i> , Copenhagen/Berlin 1941.
<i>I.Magnesia</i> =	O. Kern, <i>Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander</i> , Berlin 1900.
<i>I.Metropolis</i> =	B. Dreyer and H. Engelmann, <i>Die Inschriften von Metropolis I. (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 63)</i> , Bonn 2003.
<i>I.Milet</i> =	<i>Milet VI. Inschriften von Milet, 1–3</i> (Berlin 1997–2006)
<i>I.Mus. Varsovie</i> =	A. Łajtar and A. Twardecki, <i>Catalogue des inscriptions grecques du Musée National de Varsovie (Journal of Juristic Papyrology, Supplement, 2)</i> , Varsovie 2003.
<i>I.Mylasa</i> =	W. Blümel, <i>Die Inschriften von Mylasa, I–II (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 34, 35)</i> , Bonn 1987–1988.
<i>I.Oropos</i> =	V.C. Petrakos, <i>Οι επιγραφές του Ωρωπού</i> , Athens 1997.
<i>I.Pérée rhod.</i> =	A. Bresson, <i>Recueil des inscriptions de la Pérée rhodienne</i> , Paris 1991.
<i>I.Pergamon</i> =	M. Fraenkel, <i>Altertümer von Pergamon. VIII. Die Inschriften von Pergamon, I–II</i> , Berlin 1890–1895.
<i>I.Perge</i> =	S. Şahin, <i>Die Inschriften von Perge, I–II (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 54, 61)</i> , Bonn 1999, 2004.
<i>I.Philippi</i> =	P. Pilhofer, <i>Philippi, II. Katalog der Inschriften von Philippi</i> , 2 nd edition, Tübingen 2009.
<i>I.Priene</i> =	F. Hiller von Gaertringen, <i>Inschriften von Priene</i> , Berlin 1906.
<i>I.Ptolemaic</i> =	A.K. Bowman et al. (eds.), <i>Corpus of Ptolemaic Inscriptions, 1. Alexandria and the Delta</i> , Oxford 2021.
<i>I.Rhamnous</i> =	V.C. Petrakos, <i>Ὁ δῆμος τοῦ Ραμνοῦντος. Σύνοψη τῶν ἀνασκαφῶν καὶ τῶν ἐρευνῶν (1813–1998), II. Οἱ ἐπιγραφές (Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἐταιρείας, 182)</i> , Athens 1999.
<i>I.Rhodische Peraia</i> =	W. Blümel, <i>Die Inschriften der Rhodischen Peraia (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 38)</i> , Bonn. 1991.
<i>I.Sardes Suppl. II</i> =	P. Gauthier, <i>Nouvelles inscriptions de Sardes II</i> , Geneva 1989.
<i>I.Sestos</i> =	J. Krauss, <i>Die Inschriften von Sestos und der thrakischen Chersonnes (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 19)</i> , Bonn 1980.

<i>I.Sinuri</i> =	L. Robert, <i>Le sanctuaire de Sinuri près de Mylasa, I. Les inscriptions (Mémoires de l'Institut français d'archéologie de Stamboul, 7)</i> , Paris 1945.
<i>I.Sultan Dağı</i> =	L. Jonnes, <i>The Inscriptions of the Sultan Dağı, I. Philomelion, Thymbriion/Hadrianopolis, Tyraion (Inchriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 62)</i> , Bonn 2002.
<i>I.Thespies</i> =	P. Roesch, <i>Les inscriptions de Thespies</i> , édition électronique mise en forme par G. Argoud, A. Schachter, et G. Vottéro, Lyon 2007 (2 nd edition, 2009).
<i>I.Tralleis</i> =	M.B. Poljakov, <i>Die Inschriften von Tralleis und Nysa, I (Inchriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 36,1)</i> , Bonn 1989.
<i>I.Vallée Enipeus</i> =	J.-C. Decourt, <i>Inscriptions de Thessalie, I. Les cités de la vallée de l'Énipeus (Études Épigraphiques, 3)</i> , Athens 1995.
<i>IPArk</i> =	G. Thür and H. Taeuber, <i>Prozessrechtliche Inschriften der griechischen Poleis: Arkadien (Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien, philologisch-historische Klasse, 607)</i> , Vienna 1994.
<i>LGPN</i> =	<i>A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names</i> , Oxford 1987–.
<i>LSAM</i> =	F. Sokolowski, <i>Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure</i> , Paris 1955.
<i>LSCG</i> =	F. Sokolowski, <i>Lois sacrées des cités grecques</i> , Paris 1969.
<i>LSCG Suppl.</i> =	F. Sokolowski, <i>Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplément</i> , Paris 1962.
<i>Lupu, Greek Sacred Law</i> ² =	E. Lupu, <i>Greek Sacred Law. A Collection of New Documents</i> , 2 nd edition (<i>Religions in the Graeco-Roman World</i> , 152), Leiden/Boston 2009.
<i>MAMA</i> =	<i>Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua</i> , I–XI, London 1928–2013.
<i>McCabe, Chios</i> =	D.F. McCabe, <i>Chios Inscriptions. Texts and List</i> , Princeton 1986.
<i>McCabe, Didyma</i> =	D.F. McCabe, <i>Didyma Inscriptions. Texts and List</i> , Princeton 1985.
<i>McCabe, Miletos</i> =	D.F. McCabe, <i>Miletos Inscriptions. Texts and List</i> , Princeton 1984.
<i>Michel, Recueil</i> =	C. Michel, <i>Recueil d'inscriptions grecques</i> , Brussels 1897–1900.
<i>Migeotte, Emprunt</i> =	L. Migeotte, <i>L'emprunt public dans les cités grecques. Recueil des documents et analyse critique</i> , Québec/Paris 1984.
<i>Migeotte, Souscriptions</i> =	L. Migeotte, <i>Les souscriptions publiques dans les cités grecques (Hautes études du monde gréco-romain, 17)</i> , Geneva/Québec 1992.
<i>Milet I 7</i> =	H. Knackfuss, <i>Der Südmarkt und die benachbarten Bauanlagen (Milet. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen seit dem Jahre 1899, I 7)</i> , Berlin 1924.
<i>Milet I 9</i> =	A. von Gerkan and F. Krischen, <i>Thermen und Palästren (Milet. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen seit dem Jahre 1899, I 9)</i> , Berlin 1928.
<i>OGIS</i> =	W. Dittenberger, <i>Oriens Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae</i> , I–II, Leipzig 1903–1905.
<i>Pernin, Baux ruraux</i> =	I. Pernin, <i>Les baux ruraux en Grèce ancienne: corpus épigraphique et étude</i> , Lyon 2014.
<i>PP VI</i> =	W. Peremans et al., <i>La cour, les relations internationales et les possessions extérieures, la vie culturelle (Studia hellenistica, 17)</i> , Louvain 1968.
<i>Pouilloux, Choix</i> =	J. Pouilloux, <i>Choix d'inscriptions grecques. Textes, traductions et notes</i> , Paris 1960.

Prott – Ziehen, <i>Leges sacrae</i> =	J. von Prott and L. Ziehen, <i>Leges Graecorum sacrae e titulis collectae</i> , Leipzig 1896–1906.
<i>Repertorium Mysien</i> =	J. Stauber, <i>Repertorium der griechischen und lateinischen Inschriften aus Mysien (Ergänzungsbände zu den Tituli Asiae Minoris, 30)</i> , Wien 2022.
Rhodes – Osborne, <i>GHI</i> =	P.J. Rhodes and R. Osborne, <i>Greek Historical Inscriptions 404–323 BC.</i> , Oxford 2003.
<i>RICIS</i> =	L. Bricault, <i>Recueil des inscriptions concernant les cultes isiaques</i> , Paris 2005.
Rigsby, <i>Asyilia</i> =	K.J. Rigsby, <i>Asyilia. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World</i> , Berkeley 1996.
Robert, <i>Hellenica</i> =	L. Robert, <i>Hellenica. Recueil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques</i> I, XIII, Paris 1940–1965.
<i>SB</i> =	<i>Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten</i> , Straßburg 1915–.
<i>Schenkungen</i> =	K. Bringmann and W. Ameling, <i>Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer I. Zeugnisse und Kommentare</i> , Berlin 1995.
<i>SEG</i> =	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i> , Leiden 1923–.
<i>SGDI</i> =	H. Collitz and F. Bechtel (eds.), <i>Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften</i> , Göttingen 1884–1915.
Sherk, <i>RDGE</i> =	R.K. Sherck, <i>Roman Documents from the Greek East. Senatus Consulta and Epistulae to the Age of Augustus</i> , Baltimore 1969.
<i>Syll.</i> ³ =	W. Dittenberger, <i>Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum</i> , I–IV, 3 rd edition, Leipzig 1915–1924.
<i>TAM</i> =	<i>Tituli Asiae Minoris</i> , Vienna 1901–.
Vermaseren, <i>CCCA</i> =	M.J. Vermaseren, <i>Corpus Cultus Cybelae Attidisque</i> , I–VII, Leiden 1977–1989.
Vidman, <i>SIRIS</i> =	L. Vidman, <i>Sylloge inscriptionum religionis Isiacae et Sarapiacae</i> , Berlin 1969.
Welles, <i>RC</i> =	C.B. Welles, <i>Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period</i> , New Haven 1934.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This monograph is the result of work carried out between 2011 and 2022. Over the many years of writing this book, many people and institutions have contributed in one way or another to the final result.

My research was greatly facilitated by the semester I spent as a Research Fellow at *All Souls College*, Oxford in 2011 and by the hospitable atmosphere at the *Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik* in Munich (July 2017), to whose director, Christof Schuler, I am very grateful.

Aspects of the subject were presented in lectures and communications in Greece and abroad. In Athens, the *Epigraphic Meetings*, the *Numismatic Meetings* and the *Seminar for the History of Law* offered me the opportunity to present papers on relevant topics and to exchange views with colleagues from different fields, while similar opportunities were offered by the lectures I gave at the *Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik* and the *Workshop zur Rechtsgeschichte der griechisch-römischen Welt* in Munich, at the *Symposionaki Conference* in Athens, at the *Seminar für Alte Geschichte* at the University of Mainz and at the *Symposion 2022 der Gesellschaft für Griechische und Hellenistische Rechtsgeschichte* in Gmunden.

There are a number of people to whom I am particularly indebted and without whom this book would not have been possible. I am extremely grateful to Kostas Buraselis (*University of Athens, Academy of Athens*) for his encouragement at various stages of the project and for reading of the manuscript. I am also deeply indebted to Angelos Chaniotis (*Institute of Advanced Studies, Princeton*) for his constant support of this project to completion and for accepting the monograph in the HABES series. Throughout these years, productive discussions with my friend Eftychia Stavrianopoulou (*Karls-Ruprecht University, Heidelberg*) provided useful feedback and helped to shape the course of my research and the writing of the book.

Over the years, I have benefited greatly from the comments and discussions of my colleagues at the *National and Kapodistrian University of Athens*, Selene Psoma and Nikos Giannakopoulos, and at the *National Hellenic Research Foundation*, Christina Kokkinia and Paschalis Paschidis. I am also grateful for discussions and exchanges with Claudia Antonetti (*Ca' Foscari University, Venice*), Kaja Harter-Uibopuu (*University of Hamburg*) and Marietta Horster (*Johannes Gutenberg-University, Mainz*).

The revision of the monograph has benefited greatly from the advice and comments of Edward Harris (*University of Durham*), Ilias Arnaoutoglou (*Academy of Athens*) and the anonymous HABES reviewers. I am very grateful for their help.

Finally, I would like to thank Janet Koniordos, James Hua, Joana Apelt and Nikos Gabrielides for their linguistic and editorial assistance, and Vassia Psilakakou for her help with bibliographical research in the early stages of my research.

The publication of the book has been financially supported by the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens.

Throughout these years I have had the unfailing support of my husband Vassilis Papageorgiou, our son Kostas and my parents-in-law, who have given me the time to do my own research.

I dedicate this book to the memory of my parents, Dimitris and Kalifornia.

INTRODUCTION

My interest in the subject of this study dates back to my earlier work on the associations of the artists of Dionysos, many years ago. In that context, and in the light of benefactions made to those associations, I became curious about cases where an individual's gift to a community was designed to provide long-term funding. Attempting to understand the phenomenon and how it differed from other forms of giving, I was struck on the one hand by the fact that the last systematic collection and analysis of the relevant material was a century old, and on the other by the existence of many different views on the characteristics and significance of this phenomenon. Another aspect that triggered my interest, and at the same time added to the difficulty of addressing the phenomenon, was the imprecision of, and confusion surrounding the terms, used to describe it.

The first stage of my research involved assembling all the Greek attestations of the phenomenon through all the historical periods up to the beginning of the fourth century CE. That the volume of material had increased since Laum's time (1914) was not unexpected, given the more than one hundred years of excavation and epigraphic research and publication that have intervened. The decision to set apart (for now) the material from the Imperial period was dictated not only by its disproportionately greater extent compared to the other periods (roughly 5:1), but also by the different context in which it would have to be analysed and understood, primarily because of the gradually increasing importance of Roman law in that period and the need to take the corresponding Latin evidence, coming from Italy and the Latin-speaking West, into account. The roughly five hundred documents posterior post-dating the conventional terminal date of 31/0 BCE will be included in a future study.

The first part of the present study is devoted to presenting and analysing the phenomenon under examination. This includes the definition and description of the phenomenon and the clarification of the terms used in relation to it (chapter 1). It also includes an analysis of the administration of such gifts (chapter 2), their financial characteristics and their direct and indirect impact on the economy (chapter 3). Attention is also paid to the social-political framework within which the phenomenon occurred, which cannot be understood without knowing who the bestowers of these gifts were and who benefitted from them (chapters 4 and 5). Tables 1–4 organise the data relating to the donors, the recipients, the object and size of the gift, and the purpose it was intended to fund. Table 5 lists the endowments in chronological order. Together with graphs 1–5, the tables aim to facilitate a holistic assessment of the catalogue material and the discussion. As a whole, the first part of this study aims to offer an analysis of the phenomenon in its socio-political, economic and cultural context.

The second part contains the catalogue of the sources. These are mainly inscriptions, comprising: 1) decrees by which cities or associations accept the gift or honour the donor, or both; 2) acts of donation or bequest; 3) royal letters and edicts; 4) administrative documents (accounts, registers, lists and inventories) mentioning the specific gifts; and 5) relevant boundary-stones.

The catalogue is organised by geographical units. For the regions covered by the *Inscriptiones Graecae* the geographical organisation of that *corpus* is adopted: I. Attika, II. Peloponnese and the Argosaronic islands, III. Boiotia and Megaris, IV. Phokis, V. Lokris, VI. Thessaly, VII. Ionian Islands, VIII. Aegean Islands, IX. Euboeia. The other regions are organised into the following geographical units: X. Asia Minor, XI. Euxeinos. Pontos, XII. Syria, XIII. Kommagene, XIV. Egypt. Exceptionally, the Aegean Islands and Asia Minor are subdivided into smaller units. The following comprise those for the Aegean Islands: VIII.1. Kyklades (except Delos). VIII.2. Delos. VIII.3. Southern Sporades. VIII.4. Eastern Aegean Islands; and for Asia Minor: X.1. Aiolis. X.2. Karia. X.3. Ionia. X.4. Lykia. X.5. Mysia. X.6. Phrygia. X.7. Troas. Within all units, the material is arranged in alphabetical order by place-name.

Within the catalogue the numbering is unified, using Arabic numerals. Where an inscription records more than one gift, the numeral designates the inscription and the gift is identified by a lower-case Latin character. With the material from Delos, each number corresponds to a single endowment (cat. nos. 34–47, 49–61), although there are multiple inscriptions referring to each of these. The internal structure of the catalogue entries is presented analytically in the introductory text which prefaces the catalogue.

PART I

CHAPTER 1

REDEFINING THE ENDOWMENTS

This book studies the actions that are mostly described in the contemporary literature as ‘*foundations*’, ‘*fondations*’ or ‘*Stiftungen*’.¹ They concern a special kind of gift in the ancient Greek world: property transfers (of land or movables) effected through donation, dedication or testament, by private or public persons, during their lifetime or after their death, to some administrative mechanism or instituted collectivity, in order that the revenue generated by the investment/exploitation of the asset transferred might fund a specific purpose, specified by the donor or testator himself, on a regular basis.

1.1. THE RESEARCH TO DATE

The subject has been the focus of scholarly interest in various contexts. In a lengthy article published early in the twentieth century, E. Ziebarth listed roughly a hundred examples, which he examined from a legal perspective.² Shortly afterwards he probed more deeply into the material of these *Stiftungen*, wrote a book in which he focused on the important donation made by Eudemos for the education of the children of Miletos (cat. no. 82) and examined the importance of this type of gift for the functioning of the Greek *poleis* and their institutions.³

In 1914, B. Laum published his *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike*, which remains a standard work of reference, despite having celebrated more than a centenary. This two-volume work offers a systematic presentation of a voluminous body of documents: some 235 texts in Greek and 135 in Latin.⁴ Laum’s synthesis is not without some weaknesses. He includes in his catalogue texts that,

- 1 Mèlèze-Modrzejewski 1963, 89f. offers the following definition: ‘Le but de la fondation est d’affecter une masse de biens à un service déterminé sans limitation de durée ... c’est le capital que le fondateur confie à un organisme plus durable que l’homme, pour que ses intérêts soit affectés à un usage bien spécifié’. See also the felicitous outline of the institution that Campanelli (2016, 225–250) gives. From the lengthy explication in Laum 1914, I 1f., I select the following elements: ‘Abtretung eines Vermögens, dessen Art und Grösse vom Stifter bestimmt wird, ein vom Stifter gesetzter Zweck..., zu dessen Verwirklichung das Vermögen dienen soll... Der Zweck (muss) immer ein dauernder sein; das bedingt dass auch das Vermögen stets bestehend bleiben muss, dass also nur die Einkünfte, nicht das Vermögen selbst zur Zweckausführung verwendet werden darf’. For definitions see also Harter-Uibopuu 2015, 180 note 6.
- 2 Ziebarth 1903. Some cases had already been included in the category ‘*fondations*’ in the collection of legal inscriptions published in 1898 by R. Dareste, B. Haussoulier and T. Reinach (*I. jur. gr. nos.* 59–145).
- 3 Ziebarth 1914. His views are condensed in Ziebarth 1940, 1236–1240.
- 4 Laum’s catalogue has several double numbers, which means that the total number of *Stiftungen* it contains is slightly larger than appears from the numbering.

as we shall show, do not belong in the category of *Stiftungen* (see the cases nos. 1, 2, 3 in appendix I), while omitting all but four of the Delian examples (see Laum 1914, I nos. 52–55). Furthermore, Laum's decision to include the Latin material significantly broadened his work, but at the same time created problems: although useful, the 135 Latin texts – certainly not the full body of evidence that was available in Laum's day – are not sufficiently embedded in the context of Roman law, society and culture. Moreover, Laum failed to bring Latin and Greek testimonies into a dialogue on the level of norms and habits.

These works were followed, in 1926 and 1937, by a pair of studies focusing on foundations that arose in a family context and the religious significance of the phenomenon, which their respective authors, E. Bruck and W. Kamps, interpreted – in the light of the perceptions of their day – as a sign of decline (Bruck) or evolution (Kamps) of family. More specifically, Bruck examines the donations and bequests made for cultic and memorial purposes and sees them as a mechanism for posthumously compelling one's descendants to fulfil their ritual duties,⁵ while Kamps ascribes the phenomenon to the gradual weakening of the *genos*, which identified itself through its cult of shared ancestors, and the increasing importance of the *oikos*, which based its identity on cults founded by and dedicated to family members.⁶ In this light, Kamps examines, as primary examples, the cases of Epikteta, Diomedon and Poseidonios (cat. nos. 31, 61, 74), using the term '*fondations culturelles*'. Five inscriptions from the south-Aegean Doric area which record such gifts (cat. nos. 31, 61, 74, *IG* XII 4, 349 and 355) are also the focus of the long important article of Campanelli 2016, who describes them as 'family cult foundations'.

It was to the legal side of the matter that, starting with the very interesting case of Aristomenes and Psylla in Korkyra (cat. no. 26), A. Mannzmann directed her approach in *Griechische Stiftungsurkunden: Studie zu Inhalt und Rechtsform*, which appeared in 1962. Monographs have also been written on other isolated important texts: the testament of Epikteta (cat. no. 31) is the subject of Wittenburg 1990, while an inscription relating to the founding and funding of the festival of the Demosthe-neia at Oinoanda in the Roman Imperial period is published and analysed in exemplary fashion in Wörrle 1988a.⁷

A significant number of gifts of this type made by Hellenistic rulers to cities and sanctuaries was included in the material published by K. Bringmann and W. Ameling in 1995 under the title *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer* and further discussed in the context of royal euergetism – although

5 Bruck 1926; the term he uses is *Seelgerätstiftungen*, but he includes among them, *inter alia*, the donation by Polythrous for education in Teos (Bruck 1926, 168). The work is preceded by an earlier one (Bruck 1909), in which he examines first and foremost the legal aspect of these cases. Cf. Bruck 1955.

6 Kamps 1937, 145–179.

7 A considerable number of articles also deal with the legal and other aspects of such texts. For the gift of Attalos II to Delphi (cat. no. 22): Dimopoulou-Piliouni 2007, 437–453; Migeotte 2009/10, 203–217. For the donation of Aristomenes and Psylla in Korkyra (cat. no. 26): Migeotte 2010a, 63–69. For the donation of Aleximachos in Amorgos (cat. no. 27): Helms 2003, 464–480. For the gift of Symmasis in Lykia (cat. no. 87): Parker 2010, 103–121; Arnaoutoglou 2012a, 205–224.

not making a clear distinction between *Stiftungen* and *Schenkungen* – in a volume published in 2000.⁸

In the current century, Joshua Sosin has produced important work. In his dissertation (unpublished, but available on the internet), he focused on the economic aspect of endowments/foundations (he uses both terms), seeking to fill a gap in this approach. By emphasising the economic parameter, however, he does precisely what he criticises in Bruck, Kamps, Bringmann and Ameling, who – in his view – explain ‘the origin and purpose of the endowment in the Hellenistic world by isolating one aspect of its history and asserting that the part defines the whole’.⁹ In more recent works, Sosin stays with the same ‘closely economic’ approach, while elsewhere he revises the traditional interpretations of certain endowments.¹⁰

An examination of *Stiftungen* in various European and non-European societies, including that of ancient Greece, is given in a collective volume edited by Sitta von Reden and in a recent monograph by Michael Borgolte.¹¹

1.2. THE EVIDENCE

The vast majority of our sources for this topic are inscriptions; literary evidence and papyri are limited to just a few items.¹² A hundred Greek inscriptions from the Hellenistic period and around five hundred from the Roman Imperial period attest to this kind of property transfer. Laum’s list has been extended by texts that were not known a hundred years ago, while, conversely, some others have been removed (see appendix I).

The inscriptions belong to various categories: dedications, acts of donations or testamentary bequests (cat. nos. 4, 6, 10, 15,¹³ 20, 26 ll. 1–38, 31ii, 61, 74II ll. 12–22, 86, 87i), letters and edicts by which the kings or dynasts announce such gifts (cat. nos. 76 ll. 10–26, 83, 90, 98–100), decrees concerning the acceptance and the management of the gift (cat. nos. 5 ll. 11–33, 21B–C, 22, 25, 26 ll. 39–146, 31iii, 32, 62, 74III ll. 22–52, 79, 80, 81A, 82, 84, 87ii–iii, 94, 95),¹⁴ laws (cat. nos. 27,

8 Bringmann 2000. Ameling expresses the opinion that ‘Es scheint keine sinnvolle Grenze zwischen Stiftungen und Schenkungen zu geben’ (Ameling 1987, 15).

9 Sosin 2000, 24.

10 Sosin 2014a, 43–89; Sosin 2014b, 127–157.

11 von Reden 2015; Borgolte 2019.

12 The literary evidence from the Hellenistic period is confined to cat. nos. 3, 9, 47, 66. The only papyri we have are from the Roman Imperial age (see *P.Oxy.* IV 705 and *P.Lips.* 30 = Laum 1914, II nos. 205 and 206).

13 Cat. no. 15 is a dedication recorded on a *stèle* containing several documents of different kinds that concern sacred (movable and immovable) property in Thespiai.

14 The acceptance of the Ptolemaic donation by the city of Thespiai (cat. no. 18) is not preserved, but we find a hint of its existence in the text concerning the purchase and lease of the endowed land (ll. 5–7: [ἐδοξε τῇ πόλει οὕτως] τῶν χρημάτων γὰρ ἰαράς ὠνευσάσθῃ καὶ τὸ ψάφισμα τῷ δάμῳ; Holleaux 1897, 34). The same applies to the bequest of Gorgouthos for the Muses at Thespiai: neither the city’s decree nor Gorgouthos’ testament has survived, but they are mentioned in a decision of the city ordering their registration (cat. no. 16 ll. 28–33) and it follows a short version of the testament (ll. 33–35).

28),¹⁵ honorific decrees or inscriptions (cat. nos. 1, 2, 8, 12, 21A, 23, 24, 63, 65, 68–73, 81, 85, 88, 91–93, 96, 97, 101), accounts and registers (cat. nos. 13, 17), inventories of sanctuaries (cat. nos. 33–46, 48–60), boundary stones and dedications of land or revenues (cat. nos. 14, 30). Obviously, not all inscriptions give detailed information. There are texts that deal solely and exclusively with the specific gifts, providing many details about their investment or the utilisation of the income they yield, and others that merely mention them. The honorific decrees, for example, usually just mention the gifts briefly,¹⁶ often in conjunction with other benefactions the honoured person has performed,¹⁷ leaving the focus on the honorific discourse. The brief texts recording dedications of land are also particularly difficult to assess (see appendix II). In the Roman Imperial period, when the number of attestations of this type of gift increases spectacularly,¹⁸ there are types of inscriptions that either do not appear in the Hellenistic period, such as agonistic and funerary inscriptions,¹⁹ or are rare, such as short honorific inscriptions and edicts.²⁰ With regard to the number of inscriptions, one must bear in mind that several inscriptions may refer to a single gift,²¹ and conversely a stone can mention several gifts.²²

As already mentioned in the introduction, the substantial increase in the epigraphic material since Laum and the different, especially legal, background contexts of the Greek and Latin worlds make it necessary for practical reasons to limit our presentation to the material of the Hellenistic period, leaving aside the material from the Roman Imperial age, to which we shall return in a forthcoming work. The end of the period examined in this book is the year 31/0 BCE.²³ This chronological boundary is inevitably an arbitrary choice, as are most such time limits for the study of social, economic, legal, and religious affairs, and of human behaviour in general. For in those parts of Greece and Asia Minor that came under Roman rule in 168/146 and 131/129 BCE respectively, there were certainly Roman influences and realities throughout the period we usually refer to as Late Hellenistic.

15 The cases where the arrangements for the disposition of funds for the achievement of a specific purpose are described as a *nomos* are listed in Rubinstein 2008, 117 note 13.

16 Colpaert 2014, 193. In the decree of the Dionysiac Artists honouring Soteles and Xenola (cat. no. 23), the phrase ‘διασαφήσαντες ἐν τῷ ἀντιερώσει’ (l. 11) alludes to the dedication made by the couple; the text of the ἀντιερώσις itself has been either not inscribed in stone or not preserved.

17 See e.g. cat. nos. 1, 8, 70, 72, 92.

18 In Laum’s day, this number was much smaller, although still significantly higher than the number of those from the Hellenistic age.

19 The agonistic inscriptions of the Imperial period that record this kind of gift form a special category of inscription that comes chiefly from southwest Asia Minor – Lykia, Pisidia, Pamphylia, Kilikia (Farrington 2008, 241–249).

20 The sole short honorific inscription in the Hellenistic catalogue (cat. no. 73) comes from Larissa in Aiolis and dates from the 1st century BCE.

21 This is the case with the agonistic inscriptions of Lykia, see *supra* note 19.

22 This occurs with the accounts and registers from Delos (cat. nos. 33–46, 48–60) and the records of land leases at Thespiiai (cat. nos. 15–17).

23 In particular, the offering of a sum of *denarii* by a freedman of Caesar for a sacrifice during the festival of the Ephesia (*I.Ephesos* 859A) is not included in this catalogue, both because of its late date (50–27 BCE) and because of its Roman features.

This study sets no geographical limits. It includes Greek inscriptions from all regions: continental Greece, the Aegean and Ionian islands, Asia Minor, Egypt, and the Near East (Syria, Kommagene). While acknowledging that indigenous Egyptian, Persian or Semitic perceptions and practices play an important role in these latter regions,²⁴ I believe that the few cases recorded in Greek inscriptions from Egypt, Syria and Kommagene must be seen in the context of common Hellenistic legal practices and social perceptions, which justifies their inclusion in this study.

1.3. QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

There are a number of stumbling blocks that make it difficult to approach and understand this subject. For example, there was no special term to describe these endowments/foundations in either Greek or Roman antiquity.²⁵ Confusion is also caused by the terms that modern scholars use to label these donations/bequests.²⁶

At this point, the question arises as to how far it is methodologically sound to define, study and describe in modern terms categories that did not exist as such in antiquity, in complete knowledge of the fact that precise definitions are artificial.²⁷ It is nonetheless indisputable that we are dealing with a specific kind of gift that served specific needs and has specific legal, economic and administrative characteristics.²⁸ It is, therefore, essential to define the precise content of the phenomenon we are examining and to find an appropriate term to describe it.²⁹

24 Some examples of Egyptian and Persian *Stiftungen* dating from circa 3000–1000 BCE and concerning cult ceremonies, the care of temples and honours paid to the dead are given in translation by Laum 1914, II pp. 201–209. Especially for the *foundations* in Graeco-Roman Egypt, see Préaux 1955, 145–172; Taubenschlag 1955, 64f. A brief presentation of the *Stiftungen* in the pre-medieval Jewish world is given by Koch 2014, 46–48.

25 The problem was already addressed in Laum 1914, I 1. Méléze-Modrzejewski (1963, 90) notes : ‘Ni en Grèce, ni dans le monde hellénistique, ni à Rome il n’existe une forme juridique *sui generis* qui puisse encadrer cette institution. Le mot ‘fondation’ ... n’a pas d’équivalent ni dans le grec ni dans le latin juridiques’. Cf. below with notes 44–48.

26 The difficulties of contemporary terminology have been signalled by legal historians; see Arnautoglou 2012b, 60 note 6 and Harris 2015, 71–77, esp. 77. Cf. Harter-Uibopuu 2021, 367.

27 A related question arises with regard to the famous category of *leges sacrae*. See Parker 2004, 57–70; Harris 2015, 53–83, and Zimmermann 2016, 223–232. Addressing a similar problem in the distinction between sacred and public land in antiquity, Denis Rousset rightly observes that ‘the absence of such a systematically applied scheme in antiquity does not mean we should not attempt to develop one ourselves’ (Rousset 2013, 121).

28 Lippert 1967, 25: ‘Der Versuch, etwas über die Rechtsformen altgriechischer Stiftungen auszusagen, erscheint zunächst etwas merkwürdig, weil die damalige griechische Sprache den Begriff Stiftung überhaupt nicht kannte. Zwar gibt es eine Reihe von Ausdrücken des Gebens und Weihens, wie z.B. *διδόναι*, *καταδιδόναι*, *δωρεῖσθαι*, *χαρίζεσθαι*, *ἀνατιθέναι*, doch hat keines dieser Wörter die enge Bedeutung unseres heutigen Wortes stiften. Trotzdem besteht in der rechtsgeschichtlichen Literatur Einigkeit darüber, dass es in den antiken griechischen Rechtsordnungen Stiftungen gab’. Sosin 2000, 22 rightly observes that: ‘It is inconceivable that a city’s people would not have appreciated the difference between a one-time payment of cash to pay, say, for grain, and the dedication of an endowment that generated cash for buying grain every year “for the rest of time”’. Cf. Harter-Uibopuu 2015, 178.

29 This procedure will also provide a basis for sifting out cases that have been listed as donations or bequests of this type, but that in reality are not (see Appendix I).

An additional difficulty is posed by the diversity and breadth of the subjects upon which this phenomenon touches. To date, scholars have either approached the body of material without going into depth (Laum 1914), or have explored certain aspects of the phenomenon (Bruck 1909 and 1926; Kamps 1937; Sosin 2000) or have concentrated on a small part of the material (Mannzmann 1962).

After clarifying some matters relating to terms and definitions, this study will raise the question of whether, in antiquity, donations or bequests of this kind constituted a distinct category at any level, legal, economic or administrative, or whether they were a fruitful blend of financial and administrative practices already widely used in the world of the Greek *poleis*. We will also explore inextricably linked follow-up questions: how and why this type of gift existed? Addressing these will lead to an examination of the interaction between the individual and the community, the apparent purposes and secondary benefits of these gifts, the status of the endowers and their values and needs.

1.4. PROBLEMS OF TERMINOLOGY

A significant part of modern scholarship uses the terms ‘foundations’, ‘fondations’, ‘Stiftungen’ and ‘ιδρύματα’ (in English, French, German and Modern Greek respectively) to describe this kind of transfer of property from individuals to collectivities.³⁰ These terms – unknown in Greek and Roman antiquity – are inappropriate for two reasons. One is that they cover a very wide range of actions, including the founding of a sanctuary, a cult, the construction of a building or the erection of a statue.³¹

The second reason lies in the fact that nowadays these terms refer to legal structures or legal persons, or both, set up by an individual, a group of individuals or a family for non-profit purposes. In the ancient Greek world, however, the concept of corporate legal personality did not exist.³² Moreover, the institutional structures and

30 Migeotte 2014, 183–185 sees the *fondations* as an ‘outil de gestion’ and includes in that category not only the capital sums bestowed by kings and private individuals (in pages 187–204 he lists the nos. 13, 21, 22, 27, 28, 66, 72, 82, 84, 94, 95 of our catalogue), but other cases as well. For example, he classes as a *fondation* the account containing the money raised by a public subscription (*epidosis*) in Samos so as to provide for free annual distributions of grain (*IG* XII 6, 172; Migeotte 2014, 185–190). *Fondations* originating in various Boiotian cities also, in Migeotte’s view, provided the funding for the festival celebrated at Delion in the late second century BCE in commemoration of the Athenian victory in 424 (*SEG* 57, 452; Migeotte 2014, 197–199, 361–363). Cf. Migeotte 2014, 495–502.

31 So for example the German term ‘Stiftungen’ is applied by Rödel-Braune 2015 in a far broader sense including dedications, donations, and financing.

32 See Ziebarth 1940, 1236: ‘Stiftungen ‘im modernen Sinne’, d.h. Zweckvermögen, welche niemand als sich selbst angehören, sind dem klassischen Recht durchaus fremd’. Similarly, Petropoulos 1944, 428f. refers to ‘non self-existing foundations’ in antiquity. The disagreements surrounding the view that foundations were legal entities in ancient – especially Roman – law are presented in Feenstra 1956, 245–263 and Méléze-Modrzejewski 1963, 89 note 29. Harter-Uibopuu 2015, 181 considers that ‘Stiftungen (wurden) weder im griechischen noch im römischen Recht als juristische Personen angesehen’; according to her what we have in the ancient Greek

collectivities entrusted with the property were not founded to serve the management of the property and the purpose of the gift, but already existed.³³ It is clear that the use of a term that has a different meaning in our time for a phenomenon of antiquity creates a risk of misleading associations.

More recently, Arnaoutoglou has used the term '(proto)foundation' for institutional arrangements whereby property was not transferred to an existing collectivity but to one deliberately created by the donor/testator to manage the donated/bequeathed property.³⁴ In fact, in the cases collected by Arnaoutoglou, the endower did not offer the endowment to a pre-existing collectivity, but to an association founded by him and based on the members of his extended family.³⁵ The use of the term 'foundation' in this context is, as Arnaoutoglou rightly points out, certainly more acceptable than in the other cases. However, it should be noted that, unlike modern foundations, these family associations were not primarily set up to manage the endowment, but to serve a family cult financed by the endowment which they managed.³⁶ The association responsible for managing the endowment also provided the framework for the realisation of its purpose, i.e. the environment in which the sacrifices, banquets and other ceremonies for the gods, the founder and his family were performed.³⁷

and Roman world are *Treuhandstiftungen*, based on an agreement and without independent legal status (Harter-Uibopuu 2015, 181 note 8). Nevertheless, a passage of the *Digest* (34.5.20) from the time of Marcus Aurelius offers an indication that the concept of the legal entity existed for the associations in the high Imperial period; see de Robertis 1970, 591–594; Zimmermann 2002, 113f., and Liu 2008, 249–251.

33 In other words, the gift did not create a new legal entity but was given to institutions such as the polis or a private association, which were already in existence. On the absence of the notion of legal entity for associations and corporations in the ancient Greek world, see the analysis of Harris 1989 on the case of Athens.

34 Arnaoutoglou 2012b, 78–82.

35 These are the cases of Epikteta in Thera (cat. no. 31), Diomedon in Kos (cat. no. 61) and Poseidonios in Halikarnassos (cat. no. 74). Such a case was probably also the endowment cat. no. 78, although we are missing an important part of the text. Other cases, like those of Dorokleidas in Thera (cat. no. 103*), Epikrates in Halikarnassos (cat. no. 108*), as well as cat. no. 110* in Mylasa are doubtful (see the part of the *Dubia* in the catalogue). Nor, in my opinion, does the inscription cat. no. 77 offer evidence of the existence of an association and thus of a 'proto-foundation' in Arnaoutoglou's terminology (Arnaoutoglou 2012b, 80). Uncertain is also the case of Charmyleis (*IG* XII 4, 355; cf. appendix II.2.1).

36 There is a difference between what Arnaoutoglou (2012–2013, 65 note 20) describes as 'the founding of a quasi legal entity, the *koinon* of the family, which was charged with the management of the property' (the translation from the Greek is mine) and what actually took place: the founding of an association that was given an endowment in order to fulfil its purpose.

37 The founder of the association, who was also the endower, was, consequently, interested not only in the maintenance of the endowment and the perpetual service of the purpose, but also in the preservation of the association he founded. Thus, while in cases where gifts of this sort were made to an existing association, the association that failed to serve the purpose stated by the endower was simply replaced by another (*IG* X 2, 1, 260; *I.Hierapolis Judeich* pp. 133, 227; *I.Philippi* 133/G441 II/III), no such provision is made in cases where the association is founded by the endower; on the contrary, the endower prohibited the dissolution of the association and every proposal with similar content (see e.g. the case of Epikteta, cat. no. 31iii ll. 254–267). This difference is rightly pointed out by Arnaoutoglou 2012b, 81.

Having identified the basic weaknesses in the terms ‘foundation/*fondation/Stiftung*/ἱδρύματα’, we find that a better term for the transfer of property to institutions or collectivities in order to provide them with a permanent fund or perpetual source of income is ‘endowment’, which includes the sense of a grant or gift and applies equally whether the gift is made by donation during the donor’s lifetime or by testament after his/her death. What this term does not necessarily explain, however, is the regular and exclusive channelling of the income from the transferred property to the funding of a specific purpose, as desired by the donor. In order to make that dimension clear, our term should be extended to the more explicit ‘endowment *sub modo*’.³⁸ The term ‘*sub modo*’ is, I think, more precise than the alternative ‘*sub conditione*’ in expressing the whole way and terms by which the donor ‘binds’ the donated property, since it is not simply and solely a matter of conditions (*conditiones*). Importantly, this type of endowment is not an one-off donation, but ensures a regular, perpetual income.³⁹ Therefore the phrase that avoids any ambiguity is ‘perpetual endowment *sub modo*’.

We must not, however, lose sight of the fact that this term is nothing more than a construct, a convention. For the sake of simplicity it can be abbreviated to ‘endowment’. In this book, those who make an endowment are referred to as both endowers and donors. The movable or immovable assets are referred to as ‘dedicated property’ or ‘dedicated funds’ (in the case of money), expressions that denote the commitment of the property assets to specific uses, without presupposing their dedication to a god.

Before leaving the subject of terminology we need to consider a problem that has arisen with the use of the term ‘endowment’ in recent literature. Joshua Sosin’s definition of a perpetual endowment as ‘a revenue-generating asset whose profits are permanently earmarked to meet specified goals’⁴⁰ deprives endowments of the characteristic element of a transfer of property by donation or bequest. Consequently, Sosin uses the terms ‘foundation’ and ‘fund’ interchangeably.⁴¹ The result is that Sosin indifferently subsumes under the terms ‘endowment’, ‘foundation’ or ‘fund’ cases which have a stable funding mechanism but are not necessarily linked to a donation or bequest, inevitably leading to confusion in the use of these terms.⁴²

38 The term ‘donation *sub modo*’ is used by Préaux 1955, 161, 164–166, 168 and Méléze-Modrzejewski 1963, 90; cf. the use of the term by Harter-Uibopuu 2021, esp. 377–397, for the Hellenistic testament of Alkesippos in Delphi (here cat. no. 20) and the Roman testament of Epikrates in Nakrason. In general for this category of donation, see Benner 1888.

39 Walser 2021, 404 rightly points to the duration of the *Stiftungen* and to the fact that ‘nicht jede *donatio sub modo* auch eine *Stiftung* ... darstellt’.

40 Sosin 2000, 1.

41 As Sosin 2000, 2 also declares in the introduction to his dissertation, ‘in the interest of variation I use the words ‘endowment’, ‘foundation’ and on occasion ‘fund’ where they describe economic foundations, interchangeably. No difference is implied’.

42 The term ‘endowment’ is applied by Sosin *inter alia* to sales of land to the sanctuary at Mylasa which are leased back to the sellers at very low rates, and the formation of a capital stock for the purchase of grain by civic subscription in Samos (Sosin 2000, 78–127). Sosin follows the same practice in his later studies, see e.g. Sosin 2004b, 1–8.

1.5. CLARIFYING THE COMPONENTS OF A HYBRID STRUCTURE

Perpetual endowments *sub modo* have certain characteristics that make them a particular group within the broad category of donations and bequests.⁴³ The approach adopted here emphasizes these characteristics, not in order to propose a new definition, but to clarify the elements that constitute this specific kind of gift and to establish criteria that will make clear whether or not a particular case can be considered a perpetual endowment *sub modo*.

1.5.1. LEGAL CHARACTERISTICS

In the case of perpetual endowments *sub modo*, the transfer of the asset that is intended to be invested in order to provide revenue for a concrete purpose is effected either by donation during the donor's lifetime or by bequest (perhaps through a testament) *post mortem*.⁴⁴ The terms used for endowments made during the donor's lifetime are δωροῦμαι, χαρίζομαι, ἀπονέμω, συγχωρῶ, ἢ δόσις, (κατὰ) δωρεάν etc.;⁴⁵ the terms that appear when the transfer takes place after the donor's death are ἀπολείπω, ἀφήκω, ἐπικαταλείπω, καταλείπω, κατὰ διαθήκην, διὰ διαθήκης etc.⁴⁶ The verbs ἀνατίθημι, ἀνιερῶ, ἀφιερῶ, καθιερῶ, which signify the conse-

43 The same benefactor may, of course, combine simple donations and perpetual endowments *sub modo*. This is the case with Archippe in Kyme: the talent that her heir is bound to offer to the city to finance, from the interest it produces, the regular care of the *bouleuterion* (cat. no. 72b) is just one of her many gifts to the city (for the whole list of her benefactions, detailed over eight honorific decrees voted by the city in tribute to her, see Malay 1983, 1–20 and *SEG* 33, 1035–1041; cf. Picard 2006, 85–119). Another such case is that of Alkesippos in Delphi: since we have the whole text of his testament (cat. no. 20), we can see that apart from the endowment Alkesippos donated his whole property to the god and the city and liberated his slave Theutima (ll. 9–11).

44 Cf. Jones 1956, 166–170. Endowments are parts of testaments in the following cases: from the Hellenistic period, cat. nos. 20, 31ii, 78; from the Roman Imperial period *SEG* 21, 498 (Athens, first century CE), *IG* IX 1, 128 (Laum 1914, II 31, Elateia, second century CE), *IG* X 2, 1, 260 (Laum 1914, II 39, Thessalonike, third century CE), Keil 1943, 123 (Laum 1914, II 78, Chios, first century BCE – first century CE), *IG* XII 4, 3301 (Kos, first century CE), Herrmann and Polatkan 1969, 7–36 (Nakrason/Lydia, first century CE), *I.Perge* 77 (Perge, 117–138 CE), *I.Ephesos* 3245 (Laum 1914, II 89, *kome* Teira, Imperial period), *I.Ephesos* 5113 (Laum 1914, II 77, Ephesos, second century CE), *CIL* III 6998 (Laum 1914, II 121, Nakoleia/Phrygia, second century CE). An endowment was also part of the testament of Barkaios in Kyrene as mentioned in the honorific decree voted for the deceased Barkaios in 16/5 BCE (*SEG* 9, 4). The inscription *IGR* IV 661 (Laum 1914, II 173, Akmonia/Phrygia, 85 CE) is a decree ratifying a testament. We have a further reference to a testament in the case of Gorgouthos in Thespiiai (cat. no. 16 ll. 28–30; see *supra* note 14), while the endowment of Diogenes, son of Glaukios, which is mentioned in a decree in the honour of his son, also goes back to his will (cat. no. 96).

45 Laum 1914, I 118–126.

46 Laum 1914, I 117f.; Arnaoutoglou 2012b, 68. The neutral verb δίδωμι is used for both kinds of endowments: during the donor's lifetime in cat. no. 26 ll. 3, 5 and *post mortem* in cat. no. 31ii l. 29. Precisely the same is true of the compound 'ἐπιδίδωμι' (see for example cat. nos. 24 ll. 11f. and 31iii l. 113). 'Ἐπιδ[ο]σ[ι]ν πεποίη[ται]' is also secure in cat. no. 69 ll. 6f., where the endowment is made by testament (see *IG* XII 6 p. 97) and concerns posthumous honours.

cration of the endowment to a deity or simply imply its link with the cult, appear in both categories of endowments, i.e. during the donor's lifetime⁴⁷ and after death.⁴⁸ In the case of Archippe, the evidence records one endowment activated during her lifetime (cat. no. 72a: the 1,000 staters for sacrifices at the *bouleuterion*) and one commencing after her death (cat. no. 72b: the one talent for the purchase of slaves and the maintenance of the *bouleuterion*).⁴⁹

The terms we have cited so far are used for any transfer of property through donation or inheritance. It is only the context that can give us the supplementary, distinguishing features of the perpetual endowments *sub modo*: the purpose to be served by the endowment is introduced by ἐφ' ᾧ, ἵνα, ὅπως, ὥς etc., and its perpetual duration is expressed through the adjectives and adverbs αἰδιος, (εἰς) αἰεί, εἰς πάντα/ἅπαντα τὸν χρόνον, etc.⁵⁰

Another factor that plays an important role in this kind of endowments is the ἐπαγγελία or ὁμολογία made by the donor. These actions have, strictly speaking, no legal character and do not affect the legal essence of the property's transfer *per se*: they are commitments made by the donor to the recipient collectivity through a

47 Cat. nos. 5 l. 13; 6 l. 1; 10 l. 2; 14 ll. 3–5; 15 ll. 22–25; 29i ll. 3f.; 61i ll. 1f.; 76 l. 20; 83 ll. 54f.; 90 l. 8; 94 ll. 6f. Furthermore the money that Charilaos granted for the *Sarapieia* in Tanagra (cat. no. 13 ll. 57f.) is described as dedicated (ἀνατεθέντα, presumably to Sarapis). The precincts (*temene*) bought in Thespiai with the money endowed by Ptolemy IV and Arsinoë III were dedicated (καθιερωμένα) probably to the Muses (cat. no. 18 l. 4). In cat. no. 71 the verb ἀνατέθεικεν (l. 17) is used for the money offered by Theopompos to the city of Eretria to finance the oil for the *gymnasion*. On the link connecting education and the *gymnasion* with religion, cf. the endowment of Polythrou for the education of the children in Teos (cat. no. 84), where any breach of the rules is considered a sacrilege (ll. 50f.), while half of the money collected in fines is sacred to Herakles, Hermes and the Muses (ll. 57f.). Similar is the situation in the endowment of Eudemos in Miletos (cat. no. 82), where the fines for infractions are sacred to Hermes and the Muses (ll. 24f.). On the role of the sacred in the security of the endowments, see 2.3.2.4. According to Laum 1914, I 121, during the Roman Imperial period the ἀνάθεσις '[hat] eine wesentliche Erweiterung erfahren, indem nun vor allem auch die Errichtung einer sozialen Stiftung durch ἀνατιθέναι ausgedrückt wurde'.

48 Cat. no. 20 ll. 1, 10 (for the use of the verb ἀνατίθημι in this text see Harter-Uibopuu 2021, 37). Cf. ἀναθέν[τα κατὰ διαθ]ήκην in *I.Pergamon* 260 ll. 12f. (Laum 1914, II no. 70, first century BCE–first century CE).

49 Cat. no. 72 ll. 52f. (τοὺς δὲ χιλίους στατήρας τοῦ χαλκοῦ διαγράψαι Ἀρχίππην) and 68f. (δίδωται τὸ τάλαντον ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀρχίππης κληρονόμου). Apart from these two perpetual endowments *sub modo*, Archippe's benefactions to Kyme include her promise to leave two fields to the city after her death, which, being sold, will pay for the construction of a temple of Homonoia, an altar, porticos and workshops (Malay 1983, 8f. no. 3 = *SEG* 33, 1041 ll. 2–9). Finally, Archippe gave the city one of the two promised fields already before she died, so that the work could begin (Malay 1983, 8f. no. 3 = *SEG* 33, 1941 ll. 9–14; Picard 2006, 89, 92, 98–100 thinks that this gift of fields is also a 'foundation'; that this cannot be the case see the commentary in cat. no. 72).

50 Cat. nos. 14 ll. 8f.; 22 ll. 9f.; 27 l. 103; 71 ll. 15–17; 76 ll. 20f.; 79 l. 6; 94 ll. 9f.; 98 l. 19. In the Roman Imperial period, terms such as αἰώνιον, εἰς (τὸν) αἰῶνα, διηνεκῶς, εἰς τὸ διηνεκές are very common for perpetual endowments; see, for example, *I.Aphrodisias* 2007 11.110 ll. 17f.; *I.Aphrodisias* 2007 12.1002 l. 10; *TAM* III 109 l. 12; *I.Tralleis* 146 l. 7 = Laum 1914, II no. 98; *I.Ephesos* 22 ll. 20f. = Laum 1914, II nos. 130; *IGR* IV 661 l. 28 = Laum 1914, II no. 173. For the emphasis on duration see also cat. no. 24 ll. 10f.

firm promise. The *epangelia* is the promise made in the form of a solemn declaration through public announcement.⁵¹ In the *homologia*, which is also a public commitment, the emphasis is on the binding consent of the donor.⁵² The *epangelia* can also be made by a letter from the donor (king or royal official) to the community; the same applies to the *homologia*.⁵³ The public character of both the *epangelia* and the *homologia* guarantees the binding engagement of the donor vis-à-vis the recipient community.⁵⁴ The enforcement mechanisms here are related to the donor's standing and reputation in the community and are the very same mechanisms that drive these donations.

Elements of these two forms of public commitment may be found in many of the texts recording endowments – although the terms themselves do not necessarily appear. These texts declare – in short or detailed form – the kind of endowment, its purpose and administration and form of investment; to ensure that the regulations will be followed, punishments and fines for wrongdoers are also prescribed (see 2.3.2.1–2.3.2.3). The community receiving an endowment also had to assume specific responsibilities with regard to its administration and the maintenance of the stated purpose.⁵⁵ The endowment is therefore sometimes accompanied by the acceptance or confirmation of the recipient community (*polis*, association or other collectivity).⁵⁶ In several cases we do not have the text of the act of the endowment itself, but only the text, by which the receiving entity accepts the endowment or arranges the details of its operation.⁵⁷

- 51 Cat. nos. 32i–ii ll. 6f.; 82 l. 3. The bequest made by Epikteta in her testament is described by the association as a contribution (*epidosis*) and a public announcement (*epangelia*, cat. no. 31iii ll. 113, 126f.). The interaction between the receiving community and the donor is captured very clearly in the case of the endowment created by Eumenes II for grain purchase (*sitonía*) in Delphi: having heard what the emissaries from Delphi were seeking (τὰ ἀξιούμενα), Eumenes II declared publicly his readiness to do that (cat. no. 21C ll. 4f.).
- 52 A comprehensive synopsis of views on *homologia* and its evolution is given in Youni 2000, 221–223. On *homologia* and *homologeín*, see also Velissaropoulos-Karakostas 2011, II 214–218.
- 53 *Epangelia*: cat. nos. 76, 83, 90. *Homologia*: cat. no. 21C ll. 6f.
- 54 As a public announcement or commitment the ἐπαγγελία is not, of course, confined solely to endowments (see Velissaropoulos-Karakostas 2011, II 222–252, esp. 234–248); such public commitments are also recorded in cases of contributions (see Migeotte, *Souscriptions*, pp. 325f.), loans (e.g. Migeotte, *Emprunt* no. 102), and sundry benefactions (e.g. Malay 1983, 8f. no. 3 = SEG 33, 1041 ll. 2–9; cf. Velissaropoulos-Karakostas 2011, II 239f.). For the *epangelia* in the context of Greek euergetism and its evolution in the Roman Imperial and Early Byzantine years, see Paparriga-Artemiadis 2020, 165–190.
- 55 Not only the endowments *sub modo*, but also other donations which entailed obligations and commitments on the part of the community were followed by comprehensive and detailed acceptances; see, for example, *I.Iasos* 22 ll. 22–25 (cf. Velissaropoulos-Karakostas 2011, II 237f.), which concerns the erection of a public building (the *agoronomion*).
- 56 Cat. nos. 5 ll. 11–33; 26 ll. 39–146; 29i ll. 7–26 and ii ll. 1–26. Based on the well-known endowment of Demosthenes in Oinoanda in the Roman period, Wörrle 1988a, 23–31 offers a good analysis of the sequence from *epangelia* to acceptance.
- 57 See for example cat. nos. 18, 21B+C, 22, 32, 62, 64, 80, 94. Such decrees certainly imply an act (of unknown form) on the part of the donor, but only in a few cases is a clear reference to this act included. Thus, the acceptance decree of cat. no. 32 begins with a direct reference to the

When the donor is still living, there is apparently a possibility of negotiation between the two parties.⁵⁸ While there is little likelihood that the negotiations would end up being recorded on stone, nonetheless in some cases where both the endowment and its acceptance are preserved, we can detect differences between them. This is the case in the Hellenistic endowment of Aristomenes and Psylla in Korkyra⁵⁹ and in the endowment of Demosthenes in Oinoanda in the Imperial period.⁶⁰

The complexity of the arrangements that needed to be put in place for the operation of endowments *sub modo* might well require the recipient to make regulatory interventions of greater or lesser importance, although the intent of the donor was binding and he would usually attempt to prevent such modifications. The terms governing the endowment and binding the two parties, donor and recipient, are introduced by the phrase ‘ἐπὶ τοῖσδε’, used in the opening of the donation-dedication offered by Agasigratis to Kalaureia and the bequest-dedication made by Alkesippos to Delphi.⁶¹

It is probably not the legal nature of the endowments *per se*, but rather the process of *epangelia/homologia* by the donor and acceptance – possibly after negotiation – by the receiver that led A. Mannzmann to interpret these endowments as contracts.⁶² Mannzmann’s opinion was severely criticised by historians of ancient Greek law.⁶³ The main argument of this criticism was that, although the process of implementing an endowment *sub modo* displays *prima facie* several of the characteristics of a contract (giving and receiving, promise and acceptance, documentation and

promise (ἐπαγγελία) of the donor Argea (ll. 6–10). In the endowment of Eudemos in Miletos (cat. no. 82), while the act of acceptance is, indisputably, largely based on the *epangelia* (ll. 3–6), the reference in lines 17f. to the decisions of the *demos* nonetheless shows that some of the provisions relating to the gift and the disposition of the income from it were determined by the city. Only the ratifying texts of the cities are preserved also in the endowments of Hegesarete in Minoa/Amorgos and Polythrous in Teos (cat. nos. 28, 84 – in these cases the decrees describe themselves as *nomoi*, see *infra* note 66 and 2.2.1.1).

58 On the negotiations, see 2.1.

59 The endowment act, which expresses the will of the donors, provides that, in the case of neglect or breach of the endowment’s rules or abuse of the money, the penalty shall be the reversion of the total endowment to the donors or their descendants (ll. 29–37), while the acceptance decree of the council of Korkyra prescribes that in such cases a fine was to be paid (ll. 105–113); cf. 2.1.

60 This important text is published in an exemplary way by Wörrle 1988a. Rogers 1991, 93–95 detects divergences between the endowment act of Demosthenes and its acceptance by the city of Oinoanda. Rogers 1991, 95 rightly points out that councils and assemblies not only ratified the endowments, but also had a decisive role in their formation and to some extent in their conception.

61 Cat. nos. 6, 20 (in neither case, however, is the decree of acceptance recorded on stone). The phrase appears in other type of texts as well, including leases, Delphic manumissions of slaves, and agreements between cities (see e.g. *IG* II² 2498 l. 6; *F.Delphes* III 1, 302 l. 2; *I.Cret.* IV 179).

62 Mannzmann 1956, 127–130; Mannzmann 1962, 81–83, 110–117. In the same vein, R. Dareste, B. Haussoulier and T. Reinach, who discussed testaments and deeds of donation under the title ‘Actes, contrats’ and see in some of them a ‘caractère contractuel’ (*I.jur.gr.* pp. 175f.).

63 See especially Wolff 1962, 265–275; Latte 1962, 374–376; Triantaphyllopoulos 1962, 567–569; Méléze-Modrzejewski 1963, 82–92; Hommel 1964, 614–621.

witnessing), it cannot be a contract, since the object (capital or land) is offered.⁶⁴ What takes place is that the recipients accept the gift on certain terms. These terms are then placed in a decree or law of the community, which is responsible for their enforcement. This makes the arrangement different from a contract. Recipients have enforceable obligations and responsibilities, but the sanctions against wrongdoers do not result from the breach of a contract, but from the breach of the giver's wishes or of the rules established or validated by the community.⁶⁵

Understanding the process of creating perpetual endowments *sub modo* is easier if we bear in mind the fact that the snapshot offered by the texts is the result of a longer timeline of earlier decisions. The initial act of the endower is followed by actions relating to the commitment made by the endower to the recipient (ἐπαγγελία, ὁμολογία), the notification of the endowment, and the recipient's response (decree of acceptance). Sometimes the arrangements relating to the operation of the endowment, approved by the recipient community, acquire force of law in that community.⁶⁶ One characteristic example of the past decisions on which our image of the process is shaped, is the endowment offered by Eumenes II to the city of Delphi for financing the buying of wheat as preserved in the Delphic decree about the *Eumeneia* festival (cat. no. 21C): the king received a first embassy sent by the Delphians, listened to their requests, resolved to respond positively and authorised the delegates

64 Méléze-Modrzejewski 1963, 90: 'L'élément contractuel est donc souvent présent dans les moyens juridiques utilisés pour constituer une fondation. Cela ne veut pas dire pour autant que la fondation soit un contrat!'. Cf. the observation of Patera 2012, 54 with regard to dedications: 'Remarquons pour commencer que la formule *do-ut-des* ne s'identifie pas au contrat : elle implique une offrande qui a pour but de susciter une réaction, alors que le contrat suppose l'engagement de deux parties'.

65 According to von Reden 2015, 226 'Stiftungen erhielten Rechtskraft durch ihre Aufzeichnung und Veröffentlichung an sichtbaren Plätzen'. See however the correct objection of E. Stavrianopoulou in SEG 65, 2108: 'the act of endowment did not become legally binding through their publication ... but rather through the acts of epangelia/homologia on the part of the endower and of acceptance on the part of the recipient'.

66 The decrees with which Aigiale and Minoa, in Amorgos, and Teos accepted the endowments created respectively by Kritolaos, Hegesarete and Polythrous describe themselves as laws (= νόμοι, cat. nos. 27 ll. 3f., 131–133; 28i+iv l. 6; 84 ll. 43–45, 48–50, 52, 64f., 67). The honorific inscription for a gymnasiarch who bequeathed land to Aiolian Larissa speaks of a νόμον and διαταγήν that have been placed in the archives (cat. no. 73 l. 8). The decree with which the family association created by Epikteta accepts her testament and regulates certain questions is also described as a νόμος (cat. no. 31iii ll. 212, 243, 246, 274, 282). The decree of the association of the Attalists refers to a sacred law (νόμον ἱερόν) and to legislation (νομοθεσία) left by Kraton to the association (cat. no. 85 ll. 17, 26 – for the use of the term 'νόμος' in this case see the commentary on this endowment in the catalogue). In the decree accepting the endowment of Aristomenes and Psylla, the city of Korkyra decided that each time that a correction of the city laws occurred, the law relating to the administration of the endowment should be included into the laws of the city (cat. no. 26 ll. 137–140; for the διόρθωσις τῶν νόμων, see Psoma 2022, 282 note 52, 332 with note 234). Conversely, the text of the endowment of Diomedon (cat. no. 61) is not a law, as believed by K. Hallof and D. Bosnakis in IG (see commentary on cat. no. 61). Concerning the endowment of Kommas in Kardamyle, the city decides that the festival financed by Kommas will take place on the day that the city will decide by decree or law (cat. no. 7i l. 15: [δογ]ματοποιήσεται [ἡ] γομογραφίῃ).

to announce to the Delphians that he would grant their requests.⁶⁷ He first sent a letter to the city concerning this matter (C ll. 5f.), and followed with all the promised things according to his *homologia* (C l. 6).⁶⁸

In some cases, an understanding of the legal and procedural aspects of the endowments is complicated by the fact that several texts are compilations of earlier ones. One example is the text of the endowment of Diomedon in Kos (cat. no. 61), which, although in the form of a dedication, is nevertheless correctly described in the literature as a testament.⁶⁹ The fusion of texts in Diomedon's document is confirmed by elements of the content, such as the use or non-use of dialectal elements in different parts of the text and the use of both the first (A ll. 1–2, D ll. 120, 155) and the third person singular for Diomedon (D ll. 132f., 145f.).⁷⁰ The fact that this inscription was engraved by different hands is an additional argument for the different layers (cf. the commentary on this inscription in the catalogue). The part of the testament of Epikteta in Thera (cat. no. 31ii), that is written on stone and concerns the association, the cult and their funding,⁷¹ is not so obviously a compilation, but nonetheless contains, re-worked, elements from different phases, since it incorporates the wishes of Epikteta's husband, Phoinix, as these were expressed in his testament (ii l. 9: ἐντολάν), the adherence to which Epikteta presents as the wish of

67 Cat. no. 21C ll. 2f.: ἀπ[ο]στειλάντων ἀμῶν ποτὶ αὐτὸν πρότερόν τ[ε] πρεσβευ[τ]άς, l. 4: ὑπακούσας (i.e. the king) τὰ ἀξιούμενα, ll. 4f.: τοῖς τε πρεσβευταῖς ἐνε[τεῖλατο] ἀναγγέλλειν διότι πρόκειται αὐτῶι (i.e. the king) ἐπι[τ]ελεῖν τὰ παρακαλῆμενα ὑπὸ τὰς πόλιος.

68 Such procedures, which follow in general the same patterns, relate not only to the endowments, but characterise in general giving and taking and all kinds of gifts between kings and cities/sanctuaries (see e.g. *Schenkungen* nos. 32 [E1], 34[E], 35[E], 93[E2], 98[E], 270[E], 275[E2], 284 [E1]).

69 The main indication that the transfer of the dedicated property would take place posthumously is the fact that the cult of Herakles Diomedonteios (cat. no. 61i l. 2 – perhaps of Diomedon as well, if we accept the restoration of his name in l. 26) has the nature of a posthumous cult and that those named as officials of the association are all descendants of Diomedon but do not include Diomedon himself (ll. 9–11, 24f.). Cf. the commentary on this inscription in the catalogue.

70 According to Paton and Hicks in *I.Cos Paton* 74, part of the text seems to have been composed after the death of Diomedon. Hallof and Bosnakis take the same line in the *IG*; Paul 2013 agrees, as do Carbon and Peels in *Creek Ritual Norms* 96, who very properly give a complete framework for the composition of the text: 'the documents were pieced together from different sources: some derived from Diomedon during his act of establishment of the cult and its rules; others were added, either by Diomedon himself ... or by the family from an original document(s) produced by Diomedon; still further elements of the rules no doubt stemmed from the family itself' (cf. Skaltsa 2021b, 129: 'in Diomedon's dossier direct resonances to the testament are made in regulations inscribed on the stone in later decades'). Conversely, R. Herzog in *I.Kos Heilige Gesetze* pp. 29f. thought that the whole text was composed by Diomedon but at different times ('die Stiftung ist also schon zu Lebzeiten des Stifters in Wirkung getreten und von ihm selbst weiter ausgebaut worden').

71 See Velissaropoulos-Karakostas 2011, I 250–252, II 497–500. It is apparent that we do not have the entire testament of Epikteta. A testament may include various things, only one of which is the endowment, as is clear in the cases of Alkesippos (no. 20) and Kraton (no. 85).

their subsequently deceased son, Andragoras (ii ll. 18f.: ἐντειλαμένου ἐπιτελῆ με ποιῆσαι τὰν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Φοίνικος ἐντολάν).⁷²

Conversely, in at least one case the goal of perpetuity – an invariable element of endowments of this type – led to arrangements for the event of the death of the endower, lending the aspect of a bequest to an endowment created and activated during the donor's lifetime.⁷³

1.5.2. ADMINISTRATIVE FRAMEWORK

The recipients of perpetual endowments *sub modo* can be a civic community/collectivity (city, deme, *koinon*), a deity, or – in some cases – an association (see table 2). With the exception of private associations created at the same time as the endowment ('proto-foundations', see 1.4), these bodies pre-existed and had a given structure and specific legal and administrative tools for handling their affairs. Once accepted, the endowments would enter this structure.⁷⁴

The several aspects of the management of these endowments—the way(s) in which their recipients handled the investment, served the purpose and oversaw compliance with the terms set by the endower—will be dealt with in detail in chapter 2. The following points should be briefly highlighted here:

A) An important role in the management of endowments was played by the recipients' collective bodies: for example, the city council in the administration of the endowment of Aristomenes and Psylla in Korkyra (cat. no. 26) and of Kritolaos in Amorgos (cat. no. 27). Magistrates of the recipient entity also played an important role, especially since they could be entrusted with the investment of the transferred property or the fulfilment of the purpose of the donation: thus, for example, in the donation of Theopompos for the *gymnasion* in Eretria the purchase of the oil and the investment of the capital were entrusted to city officials (cat. no. 71).

B) The legal mechanisms of the cities were also used in the collection of fines from those who violated the provisions of endowments or from officials who did not carry out their duties in the administration of such endowments; this is the case with the *euthynoi* in the endowment of Polythrou in Teos (cat. no. 84 ll. 59f.) and the *boulomenos* in that of Kritolaos in Aigiale, in Amorgos (cat. no. 27 ll. 119f., 125–130).

C) The cities that received endowments could use existing laws for their administration. For example, Miletos used its market and education laws to regulate matters concerning the endowment of Eudemos (cat. no. 82 ll. 61–64) and Delphi used the law about *μαστροί* (= officials) against those who would abuse the endowment

72 Cf. cat. no. 87, where the association's text (sides ii and iii) appears to have incorporated passages from the text composed by Symmasis (see the commentary of the inscription in the catalogue).

73 This is the case with the endowment offered by Phainippos in Iasos (cat. no. 75) to fund a cult; the endowment provides extensively for matters that will arise after the death of the endower (ll. 12–22).

74 Harter-Uibopuu 2011, 119: '... foundations required relatively complex procedures of investment and management of the capital in order to produce a regular income ...'.

of Attalos II (cat. no. 22 ll. 48–53). Also, the donation of Aristomenes and Psylla cites the law of the *agonothetes* (cat. no. 26 ll. 15f., 22f., 80f., 86f., 93–95), while that of Kritolaos refers to the gymnasiarchic law (cat. no. 27 ll. 81–83).

D) Some matters relating to endowments were handled similarly to other cases: for example, the payment of interest on the loans from the Kritolaos capital in Aigiale, in Amorgos, followed the rules that applied to sacred funds (cat. no. 27 ll. 19, 31f.).

E) Two other instruments that were common and helpful in civic administration, namely the oath and the rendering accounts required of magistrates, were also applied to endowments to prevent violations of their rules.⁷⁵ I mention just two cases: in the endowments of the Attalids at Delphi the *epimeletai* took an oath at the beginning of their term of office (cat. no. 21B l. 1 and 22 ll. 38f.) and in the endowment of Agasikles and Nikagora, as well as in that of Agasigratis in Kalaureia the oath of the *epimeletai* was connected with their accountability at the end of their term of office (cat. nos. 5 ll. 28–31 and 6 ll. 15f.).

From the administrative point of view there is no element that could be said to be peculiar to endowments and to give them a special characteristic. The recipients of these donations made use of familiar administrative mechanisms.

1.5.3. FINANCIAL CHARACTERISTICS

Perpetual endowments *sub modo* aim to preserve intact the asset (land or money) bestowed or bequeathed and to invest it in such a way that it yields an income to provide perennial support for the stated purpose.

In essence, linking income to expenditure was a common practice with various applications in the economics of the ancient Greek world, for the sake of greater efficiency and better long-term control of the finances.⁷⁶ Cities could commit specific revenues to the regular service of specific expenses.⁷⁷ Migeotte uses the term ‘fondations’ for revenues that are firmly assigned for a long period of time to specific expenditures and thinks that it was the commonest way of managing a city’s financ-

⁷⁵ In general on the accountability of the magistrates in the civic administration see Fröhlich 2004.

⁷⁶ With regard to this, the long budgetary period (nine-year budget) in Xanthos (*SEG* 38, 1476 ll. 54f.) is characteristic, although one cannot exclude the possibility that this unusual length was due to the economic difficulties the city was facing (Migeotte 2014, 62f.).

⁷⁷ A characteristic example is the amounts Athens raised for military expenses in 374/3 BCE from the grain production of the Athenians living in Lemnos, Imbros and Skyros (Stroud 1998, p. 5 ll. 53–55). The Milesian decree establishing an annual distribution of grain on the birthday of Eumenes II sets aside part of the city’s commercial loans to finance the purchase of wheat (*I. Didyma* 488). For the reservation of interest on loans to finance certain expenses (specifically, expenses for sacrifices) see *IG* XII 7, 241 ll. 9–13. Another, later, example of the care with which basic expenses were linked to specific revenues comes from the community of Toriaion (or Tyr-iaion) in Asia Minor: Eumenes II assigned the tax revenues collected by the *agoranomos* to the purchase of oil for the *gymnasion* until land or fields or other tithable property should be found (*I. Sultan Dağı* I 393 ll. 42–47; especially on oil as an item of expenditure, see also 4.3.2). The same management logic was also applied in the case of the Ptolemaic *apomoirai*, tax revenues designated for maintaining the cult of Arsinoe Philadelphos (Clarysse and Vandorpe 1998, 5–42).

es.⁷⁸ The linking of specific revenues to specific expenses exists also in the liturgies, *epidoseis* and loans whose coverage of the expense is, however, not constant and recurring.⁷⁹

But, although based on a standard economic model, the endowments had additional characteristics that make them a distinct means of funding specific purposes. The basic characteristics that prevent confusion with other cases are:

The property (land or money) that will generate the funds for the financing of the purpose has to be privately owned at the moment of transfer. The dedication of other than private property for the financing of a specific purpose is not an endowment.⁸⁰ *Komai* or lands that were granted by Hellenistic kings to sanctuaries to finance cult activities can be considered endowments because they were royal property (cat. nos. 98–100).⁸¹

The property has to be transferred through donation, dedication or testament by an individual who (co-)specifies the use of the donation or bequest, or, exceptionally, by a number of individuals who are connected in some way. Capital sums created by subscription from a large number of individuals (*epidoseis*), such as the fund amassed from the contributions of the citizens of Samos to finance, from the interest on it, the purchase of grain for free distribution to the people, cannot be considered endowments as defined above.⁸² The same applies to money or land used to support specific purposes through its income, when the origin of the property is not clear, such as in the case of the lands leased and funds lent by the *demos* of Plotheia in Attica to provide an income to cover certain expenses; in this case there is no evidence of any dedication, donation or bequest.⁸³ Nor can we describe as a perpetual

78 Migeotte (2014, 176–192) gives the term a broad content (cf. *supra* note 30). A solid link with specific expenditures is also, in Migeotte's view, a characteristic of what he calls *fonds de roulement*. Cf. Harter-Uibopuu 2013a, 52: 'Wenn auch für die hellenistischen und kaiserzeitlichen Städte kein detaillierter Haushaltsplan oder Budgetvoranschlag nachgewiesen werden kann, zeigen die erhaltenen Quellen doch deutlich, dass die Verwendung von Geldern aus den städtischen Kassen oftmals an einen bestimmten Zweck gebunden war'.

79 Dealing with capital funds, Gabrielsen 2008, 122–126 also uses the term 'foundations' and adds to them the formal *epidoseis* by a number of individuals, the gifts donated to a city by a benefactor and the consecrations of money to a god by an individual. According to him they were hybrids between a loan, an *epidosis* and a *Stiftung*.

80 This is the case with the lands of the *Nea*, the rent from which was to form a capital stock that would be lent to generate revenue for the Little Panathenaia (*IG* II³ 447 = Rhodes – Osborne, *GHI* no. 81, 335/4–330/29; cf. Papazarkadas 2011, 22, 46f., 53f., 56, 59, 85f., 94, 140).

81 We note, however, that including these cases, which concern the relations of Hellenistic kings with non-Greek sanctuaries, in the Greek endowments may be stretching a point, because they are, in part, a continuation of practices that pre-existed the Greek presence in the specific regions (see 1.3 with note 24).

82 *IG* XII 6, 172, circa 260 BCE; cf. Sosin 2000, 78–109; Migeotte 2014, 185–187. On sides B and C of the stone is a list of citizens and the sums they contributed. The grain had to be bought every year from Anaia (an area in the Samian Peraia) at a low price, which was fixed in advance and which was paid to Hera, who apparently had sacred lands in that area (A II. 23–25). Two similarities between subscriptions (*epidoseis*) and perpetual endowments *sub modo* are the promises of subscribers and endowers and the exclusive use of the money for a specific purpose (for the subscriptions see Ellis-Evans 2013, 116f.).

83 *IG* I³ 258. Migeotte 2014, 498f. classifies the case of Plotheia among the 'fondations au niveau

endowment *sub modo* the mere regular funding of a purpose without specification of an original gift and its investment: thus, in the case of Metropolis in Ionia, where a certain Apollonios secured regular sums from Attalos II to finance the subsidy of olive oil for the *gymnasion* and children's education;⁸⁴ the evidence attests to the regular receipt of funds from the king to finance certain purposes, but not to a gift and its investment.

It is obviously useful to identify the specific characteristics that allow us to distinguish between perpetual endowments *sub modo* from other forms of permanent funding for specific purposes in public finances. The question nonetheless arises as to how restrictive they should be, especially since they are characteristics that we have designated as markers to define a category – that of perpetual endowments *sub modo* – which, while existing, was not precisely so perceived in antiquity. In this context I must confess that I am somewhat at a loss with regard to the case – to the best of my knowledge, the only one of its kind – of the 700 Aiginetic drachmas that Antigeneidas offered to Koroneia, in Boiotia: the money would be used to buy grain at a low price, which would be sold to the people at the same low price later on, when the market price had risen.⁸⁵ This is a typical *fonds de roulement*, where specific funds are linked to outlays for a specific purpose, while the capital itself is neither spent nor invested but simply recycled.⁸⁶ The fact that in Koroneia the capital came from a private donation assimilates the case to the category of perpetual endowments *sub modo*, although the capital was not to be invested, as was the rule for such endowments, but rather reconstituted each year from the sale of the grain. But can we say that there was no investment and no return at all? Can we ignore the fact that the purchase and resale of the grain at low prices, as prescribed by the gift, constituted a movement of funds that brought about a return, namely the savings for the community achieved through buying at a low price and then passing this on? The practice established by this particular gift does not, of course, fully correspond to what we expect to find in a perpetual endowment *sub modo*, that is, the investment of the donated assets and the service of the declared purpose through the income thus generated. Here, the placement of the funds is aimed at recycling them, while the purpose of the gift is served by this recycling.⁸⁷ The problematic aspects of this particular case clearly demonstrate the limitations of the categories we are trying to establish.

We can therefore say that, from the standpoint of administration, as well as from the legal and economic standpoints, there is no element that is used specifically for

local' (see Migeotte 2010c, 53–72) and Millett 1991, 236 considers 'the Plotheian decree ... a clear case of the foundation mentality'; Millett points that this case is 'not included in Laum', but we would not expect to find it among Laum's *Stiftungen*.

84 *I.Metropolis* 1B ll. 23–26: ἐξεπορίσατο δὲ καὶ παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως διὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐκτένειαν καὶ τοῖς νέοις εἰς ἐλαιοχρίστιον καθ' ἑκάστον ἐνιαυτὸν δραχμὰς φ' *vac.* ὁμοίως δὲ [κ]αὶ τοῖς ἐλευθέροις παισὶ εἰς τὰ μαθήματα < φ'.

85 Migeotte 1993b, 11–23; Sosin 2000, 109–126; Migeotte 2014, 178f.

86 This form of funding is not unusual in public finances. For other *fonds de roulement* serving grain purchases, see Migeotte 2014, 176–183.

87 Cf. the uncertain case of Eumenes' endowment for the purchase of grain in Delphi (cat. no. 21a): was the money invested to buy grain from the income or was it a *fonds de roulement*? (see 5.1.3).

these gifts and that gives them a specific character. An examination of the individual elements that make up these endowments reveals how such legal categories were conceived: not as a particular category in itself, but as a construct based on a combination of known and tested practices and procedures. Perpetual endowments *sub modo* were a patchwork of known legal, economic and administrative instruments and practices. The pre-existing recipients of these endowments used familiar mechanisms to manage the endowed assets, and the few associations set up for this purpose also used tested management systems. Nevertheless, the specific characteristics of this way of transferring assets clearly distinguish these endowments from other forms of permanent funding.

CHAPTER 2

SETTING UP AN ENDOWMENT: PRINCIPLES OF ADMINISTRATION

Every gift, even the simplest, places upon the recipient an administrative obligation, even if this is nothing more onerous than placing a votive figurine on a shelf in the sanctuary. Donations or bequests that transfer money or property to a god or a collective entity naturally require more extensive management. Perpetual endowments *sub modo* are precisely the type of gift that places the most complex demands on the recipient, because they need to be invested and are expected to run indefinitely. The recipient (community or god) adds the donated property to its existing assets and exploits this using the mechanisms at its disposal.⁸⁸

One interesting aspect of the way such gifts are managed is that the dedicated properties tend to retain their independent identity; they are set apart in a separate fund and not added to the general state budget. A characteristic example is the *stoa* of Antiochos in Miletos (cat. no. 81; see 5.1.7), whose rental income would be entered into a special account (cat. no. 81A1. 22: κατατάσσειν δ' αὐτήν καθ' ἐαυτήν). The several Delian endowments remained distinct from the rest, and continued to preserve their discrete identity even when, after 229 BCE, some of them were amalgamated into a common fund, the ἐστιατικόν.⁸⁹ The capital donated by Eudemos also remained separate: although it was used along with the city's other capital funds in the public bank of Miletos, it retained the title 'τὰ ἐπιδοθέντα ὑπὸ Εὐδήμου χρήματα εἰς παιδείαν τῶν ἐλευθέρων παίδων' (cat. no. 82 ll. 14f.), illustrating very well the fact that in the endowments money tends to be classified both by their purpose and their origin. The income from it was set aside to be used exclusively for the stated purpose (ll. 64f.). This method of handling is, of course, in accord with the endowers' desire for perpetuity and remembrance,⁹⁰ but it is also conducive to the most effective oversight and control of the endowments. This is clear from the endowment of Symmasis, where the administrators took care to record on the loan contracts that 'this money comes from the gift of Symmasis'.⁹¹ In the endowment that Theopompos created for the *gymnasion* in Eretria, the money is placed in a

88 Laum 1914, I 224–233. In the case of a new cult, where there is no pre-existing mechanism, the endower stipulates how matters shall be handled. In some cases (as for example with family associations, cf. 2.2.2) we have considerable related information; in others (cat. no. 9) we do not.

89 For the distinct identity of the Delian endowments despite the amalgamation due to the handling and safekeeping systems, see catalogue VIII.2. Introduction.

90 The same purpose was served by the fact that some festivals and celebrations funded by endowments bore the name of the endowers (see 4.3.1).

91 Cat. no. 87i ll. 34–40: τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον ὃ δέδωκεν Συμμασις ἐκτοκιοῦσιν οἱ χιρισται ὥς ὅτι ἀσφαλέστα(τα) προσγράφοντες ἐν τοῖς συναλλάγμασιν ὅτι ἐστὶν τοῦτο τὸ ἀργύριον τῆς Συμμασιος δοσέως. Security was also assured by the city's commitment to cover any

separate account as well (cat. no. 71 ll. 64f.: ὑφεστηκότος παρὰ τῷ ταμίᾳ κατ' ἰδίαν λόγῳ). This autonomy is confirmed by the endowment created by Charilaos for the *Sarapieia* at Tanagra, where the surplus was to be returned to the endowment fund to be invested with the capital (cat. no. 13 ll. 71f.; cf. 3.1.1 with note 245).

Nevertheless, within the framework of the particular civic entity or sanctuary that was the beneficiary, these gifts could be amalgamated into existing management and accounting (e.g. lending) mechanisms without losing their nominal autonomy, thus ensuring the maximum return at the lowest possible cost.⁹²

In this chapter we will look at questions relating to the management of endowments, their investment and the realisation of their purposes, as well as matters relating to their protection.

2.1. THE RECIPIENT AND ADMINISTRATOR

Endowments were always created by one or more individuals. Their recipients were usually cities⁹³ or, less frequently, subdivisions of a civic community (cat. nos. 10, 28, 63, 69, 80, 97) or larger bodies, such as the Achaian League (cat. no. 3) or the Koinon of the Ionians (cat. no. 83). Endowments were also often granted to associations.⁹⁴

Many of the endowments handled by cities appear as dedications to gods.⁹⁵ This consecration did not put the funds outside the authority and ownership of the *polis*.⁹⁶ Kalaureia managed two endowments dedicated to Poseidon and earmarked for sacrifices (cat. nos. 5, 6). Thespiiai managed the land bequeathed by Gorgouthos to the Muses (cat. no. 16). At Ioulis, in Keos, the money that Epameinon and his sons dedicated to the gods for repairs to sanctuaries and for a sacrifice was also apparently

shortfall from its own resources, as is made clear in the endowment that Polythrouos created for Teos (cat. no. 84 ll. 46–48).

92 This is confirmed by the practice of lending through a public or temple bank and the involvement of civic magistrates or temple officials in the handling of the gift (see 2.2.1.3). Delos furnishes characteristic examples of perpetual endowments *sub modo* that retained their autonomy within a common management system (see catalogue VIII.2. Introduction). Indeed, the fact that in Delos a loan could draw on funds from multiple endowments without these losing their discrete identities (see for example the Timaretos loan in *I.Délös* 449 ll. 27–32) is indicative of the freedom with which the sanctuary could handle its lending.

93 For example cat. nos. 7, 12, 13, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 82, 84, 89. For a global picture of the recipients of this type of gift, see table 2 and graph 2.

94 For example to the *Dionysistai* in Piraeus (cat. no. 1), the *Amphiarastai* in Rhamnous (cat. no. 2), the association of (Dionysos) Anthister in Thera (cat. no. 32), the *lampadistai* in Patmos (cat. no. 65), the *Attalistai* in Teos (cat. no. 85), the coppersmiths in Lykia (cat. no. 87) and the landowners in the Egyptian *kome* of Psenamosis (cat. no. 101). See also Aneziri 2020a.

95 For these gifts as dedications see Harris 2015, 71–77. These cases are differentiated from those in which the divine is invoked solely for the protection of the endowment (see 2.3.2.4), although dedication to a god provides its own insurance, of course.

96 Rousset rightly observes that the consecration is ‘une procédure destinée simplement à donner à ces biens, parmi tous ceux de la cité, un statut particulier et à réserver leur utilisation’ (Rousset 2015, 382).

handled by the city (cat. no. 29).⁹⁷ In Miletos, the gift made by Antiochos for the *ιερόν τὸ ἐν Διδύμοις* was managed by the *δήμος ὁ Μιλησίων* (cat. no. 81A ll. 19–23; see the commentary on the inscription in the catalogue), and the same seems to apply to Kos, with the property that Phanomachos dedicated to Zeus and the Demos (cat. no. 62). In a decree for Teleutias in Kos (cat. no. 64), too, where the income from his dedication to Asklepios, Hygieia and Epione was intended for their cult, the city's involvement is clear despite the fragmentary preservation of the text.⁹⁸ At Olymos, the city handled the funds that Pistos bequeathed to Apollo, Artemis and the other gods of the *demos*, using the money to buy land (cat. no. 79). At Lampsakos, the city and the public bank were involved in the management of an endowment dedicated to Asklepios for his cult (cat. no. 95); the same occurred at Ilion with the money that the priest of Hermes dedicated to Athena, also for her cult (cat. no. 94).⁹⁹ Sometimes the formulation that constitutes the core of the endowment links god and city together as recipients: thus, Louson, the priest of the Muses, dedicated jointly to the Muses and the city a sum of money for sacrifices during the *Mouseia* (cat. no. 15) and Alkesippos dedicated money for a festival that would bear his name to Apollo and the city of Delphi (cat. no. 20). At Histros, the Muses and the Demos appear side by side as recipients of sums offered by Diogenes, son of Glaukios, for sacrifices and a *symposion* respectively (cat. no. 96).

The same applies in the case of endowments addressed to subdivisions of civic communities: thus, the Aigosthenitans, a community (*κοινόν*) that belonged to Megara, managed the land dedicated by Arete to Poseidonios and the community (cat. no. 10); the deme of the Samians in Minoa, in Amorgos, managed the endowment of Hegesarete for the festival of the Mother of the Gods (cat. no. 28); the deme of the Antimacheians in Kos managed the endowment of two *hierotamiai* for sacrifices and banquets (cat. no. 63); the *chiliasteres* of Epidaurians in Samos managed the endowment of Xenombrotos for sacrifices (cat. no. 69); the community of the Syrnioi managed the endowment of Euagis for sacrifices to Asklepios and the other gods (cat. no. 80); the tribes of Histros in Euxeinos Pontos managed the endowment of Meniskos for cult and honorific purposes (cat. no. 97).

Dedications to gods exist also in cases where the recipient and administrator of the endowment is an association, which usually served the cult of the god in question.¹⁰⁰ The gift (whether of money or land is not known) that Soteles and his wife

97 It is interesting that in this specific instance the city is represented as receiving the money from the gods (cat. no. 29i ll. 9f.). The relation between the sacred and the secular in these endowments appears in varied forms. As Sosin rightly observes (Sosin 2000, 573) in connection with the two endowments from Amorgos, namely those of Kritolaos in Aigiale (cat. no. 27) and of Hegesarete in Minoa (cat. no. 28): 'The Minoan endowment differs from its Aigialitan cousin in numerous respects. Kritolaos' endowment funded cult, but was under civic management and presumably conceived as belonging to the state. Hegesarete's endowment, on the other hand, belonged to the goddess'.

98 Cat. no. 64 l. 7: τοῖς βουλευταῖς, l. 24: [τ]οῖς τραπεζῖται, l. 25: [ὁ δ]ᾶμος, l. 34: τοῖς πολῖται[ς].

99 The money was accepted by the city: [καθ]ήκει δὲ τῷ δήμῳ ἀποδεξαμένῳ αὐτοῦ τὴν φιλ[α]γ[α]θίαν τε καὶ σπουδὴν (cat. no. 94 l. 7).

100 The private associations imitate the languages and practices of the city-state (see Harris 2021, 28–34).

Xenola offered to the association of the Artists of Dionysos of Isthmos and Nemea, which was based in Opous, was dedicated to Apollo, Hermes and the Muses and was designated for sacrifices to them (cat. no. 23).¹⁰¹ Sarapis and the association of *hypostoloi* of his cult were the recipients of an endowment created by Kriton, priest of Sarapis at Demetrias (cat. no. 24), while Herakles Diomedonteios and the family association that was founded to conduct the related cult were the recipients of an endowment created by Diomedon (cat. no. 61).¹⁰² The proceeds of the land endowed by the Ptolemaic official Menyllos to the association of the *Basilistai* at Limyra in Lykia were intended for sacrifices to King Ptolemy (cat. no. 86).

In all these cases, whether the recipient of the endowment is a city, a subdivision of a city, a Koinon or an association, the endowments serve purposes directly or indirectly connected with gods – for the most part sacrifices and festivals. The administration of the investment and the implementation of the prescribed purpose were in the hands of the community, which had the necessary legal status to make decisions relating to the endowments, confirming the intention of the endower and settling any further details. Priests and other religious officials, such as the *hieropoioi* and the *epimenioi*, contributed to the ritual procedures and the management of the ceremonies funded by the endowments, but their contribution was also regulated by decisions of the community.¹⁰³

One may conclude that the evidence on the endowments seems to confirm the very close financial and functional connection between sanctuaries and cities. Even in endowments (Thespiiai, Delos, Kos, Mylasa, Olymos) where the gods appear as exclusive recipients (cat. nos 16, 17, 33-60, 64, 76, 79) the institutions of the community were involved in the administration of the endowment. I will not enter into the long discussion of the relation between sacred and public property and the corresponding treasuries, for that is obviously beyond the scope of our subject,¹⁰⁴ but will confine myself to the following observation concerning the endowments:

101 For the specific gods honoured by this association, see 3.2 note 396.

102 Since none of the terms commonly designating an ancient Greek association, e.g. σύνοδος, κοινόν, συγγένεια, appears in the case of Diomedon, there has been doubt as to whether this was in fact an association. According to J.-M. Carbon and S. Peels in *Greek Ritual Norms* 96: ‘The family of Diomedon does not necessarily constitute a formalised association’. Paul seems to recognise a general ‘cadre familial’ (Paul 2013, 116). However, the formulations used for the participants (τοὶ τῶν ἱερῶν κοινωνοῦντες in cat. no. 61iii ll. 81, 87, μετέχειν τῶν ἱερῶν in ii l. 53, D l. 147) express the membership and the joint activity and reinforce the impression of a duly constituted association. The existence of an association is further indicated, in my opinion, by the εἰσαγώγιον to be paid upon the birth of a male child (ii ll. 51f.), the existence of a general meeting (iii ll. 93f.: [συνα]γωγή) and the officials, e.g. the priest and the *epimenioi* (ii ll. 40, 63f., 66f., iii l. 102, iv ll. 141–145).

103 The active role of the community in cult affairs is indicated by the wording of Alkesippos’ gift of money to Apollo and the city of Delphi for the festival of the *Alkesippeia*: ὥσπερ θυσίαν καὶ δαμοθoinίαν συντελεῖν τὰν πόλιν τῶν Δελφῶν τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Πυθίῳ κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν (cat. no. 20 ll. 4f.; cf. Rousset 2015, 388f.). On the management of such funds by the city, see also the case of Delphi in cat. no. 19 ll. 60f. (cf. Rousset 2002, 267–269).

104 The connection is indisputable. Views differ only in relation to the degree of distinction and autonomous existence of sacred funds within the finances of the cities. See Rousset 2013, 113–133 (cf. the commentaries in *SEG* 64, 2228) and Rousset 2015, 369–393.

gods appear as exclusive recipients of perpetual endowments *sub modo* without any support of any civic community or an association only in the few cases where they are not native Greek gods, even if in the course of time they acquired Greek characteristics or at least Greek names (cat. nos. 98, 99, 100).¹⁰⁵

In many other cases the texts that we have at our disposal are inscriptions of a type that is not concerned with giving details about the administration of the endowments. This applies to the many endowments that, during the period of Delian independence, were offered to, primarily, Apollo, Artemis and Leto and were recorded briefly in the accounts and inventories of the sanctuary (cat. nos. 33–46, 48–60). Boundary-stones also belong to this category, as do the registers of leases of sacred lands, especially from Thespiiai, where we recognise with certainty four endowments (cat. nos. 14, 15, 16, 17) and suspect the existence of several more (see appendix II.2). Our information about these endowments is scanty, but we know enough about the management of the dedicated capital assets in Delos and at Thespiiai (see 2.2.1) to be in no doubt about the involvement of the city in each case.

In sum, we may say that communities with an institutional status are present in the administration of the perpetual endowments *sub modo* that were created for gods, except for those offered to sanctuaries of Near Eastern divinities. In all other cases it was the cities and associations that provided the mechanisms and the necessary tools for the management of donations and bequests of this type and which, through their own institutions, guaranteed the operation of the endowments, enacting protection clauses or ratifying those prescribed by the endower and ensuring compliance (see 2.2 and 2.3.2). Sanctuaries of the Greek type were neither collective entities nor endowed with the institutional status that would permit them to engage in such proceedings. The role of the community is entrenched and unshakeable for the additional reason that its acceptance strengthens the legal status of the endowments, and in essence transforms them from private acts into decrees and civic laws. In this context it is of particular interest that, in some cases, the text with which the community accepts the endowment and makes arrangements pertaining to it is described as a νόμος.¹⁰⁶

Communication between the endower and the recipient entity is a given. The acceptance decrees that we have at our disposal (see 1.2 and 1.5.1) are the final outcome of a communication that (we may assume) involved negotiations between the individual and the community, although it is impossible to ascertain their content.¹⁰⁷ As in the whole spectrum of acts of benefaction, the creator of an endowment engages in a dialogue with the community, and perhaps more intensely than in other cases, since here there are matters of investment and of ensuring perpetuity that must

105 On the identity and the characteristics of Phoenician Zeus of Baitokaike in Syria (cat. no. 98), see Bonnet 2015, 143–149; Ahmad 2018, 161–165. On the Persian and Zoroastrian traces in the endowments of Antiochos I of Kommagene (cat. nos. 99, 100), see Panaino 2007, 117–131; for the Graeco-Iranian syncretistic *pantheon* see Schütte-Maischatz 2003, 103–113; Facella 2006, 225–297; Dunand 2006, 135–137; Versluys 2017.

106 See 1.5.1 note 66.

107 On ‘the importance of negotiating when giving and receiving’, see Colpaert 2014, 190f. For the deals between benefactors and cities, see Kokkinia 2011, 97f. note 1 and Müller 2011, 353–356.

be settled. In some royal endowments, the communication between endower and recipient took the form of an exchange of embassies. Thus, the endowments offered by Eumenes II and Attalos II to Delphi followed embassies dispatched by the city to the two kings, as we learn from the civic decrees.¹⁰⁸ We also have communication and agreement between endower and recipient through embassies in the cases of Miletos (cat. nos. 81B ll. 7–10 and 83 ll. 2–5).¹⁰⁹

We have to accept *a priori* that the degree of involvement and influence of endower and recipient in the formation of the endowment differed from case to case. It is obvious that where a mechanism for managing and investing money or property existed, as in Delos, Thespiiai and the cities that had a public bank, several matters were already regulated and the endower had little to no possibility of intervening (see 2.2.1.3). There are also indications suggesting that, when the endower did not belong to the community and especially when he was at some distance from it, as is the case particularly with royal endowments, the recipient community had greater freedom in handling various matters relating to the endowment.¹¹⁰

It is in any case difficult to assess the degree of intervention by the recipient community in the shaping or modification of the terms of the endowments, since the information we have is limited. The clearest evidence is furnished by the endowment created for the city of Korkyra by Aristomenes and Psylla (cat. no. 26), where the city council plays a particularly important role in its administration. In its decree of acceptance, the council appears to amend the initial intent of the endowers in favour of the city: specifically, while the donors Aristomenes and Psylla state that, in the event of any infringement, the endowed amount of money is to be returned to themselves or their heirs (ll. 29–37), the city council prescribes that anyone who attempts to use the money for any purpose other than the hiring of artists or who misuses the money must pay the donors or their heirs 60 *minai* and double the misused money (ll. 66–76). The penalty set by the city is a clearly less onerous version of the one imposed by the endowers. Elsewhere in this decree we find a partial modification to the donors' expressed wish: at the end of the decree, the council resolves that 'all the rest' (τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα) – that is, everything relating to the gift that has not been regulated in the preceding part of the decree – shall be settled by the council and the citizen's assembly

108 For the embassies that the city of Delphi sent to Eumenes II, the petitions they presented to him and his response, see 5.1.3 with note 512, 513. The same emissaries were sent to Attalos II with various petitions (cat. no. 22 ll. 2–5; cf. also 5.1.3). Cf. also the Achaians' refusal to accept the endowment offered to the Achaian League by Eumenes II, following the embassies sent by the king and the discussions in the Achaian assembly (cat. no 3; 5.1.1).

109 The embassy that the Koinon of the Ionians sent to Eumenes II in cat. no. 83 was not asking for financial aid, but presenting an honorary decree; the king responded positively and part of this positive response was the endowment funding a day commemorating him during the Panionian festival. See 5.1.7.

110 For example, Aristomenes and Psylla had an undisputed voice in the investment of, and return on the money they gave to Korkyra (cat. no. 26), while this does not appear to be the case with the endowments offered by the Attalids to Delphi (cat. nos. 21, 22). See the analysis of these cases in 3.1.1; especially for the *sitionia*-endowment of Eumenes II to Delphi, see further 5.1.3. Freedom of the recipient is also to be assumed in the management of the endowment, that Ptolemy IV offered to Thespiiai (see the analysis in 5.1.2).

(ll. 139f.), whereas in their own text the donors assign all matters relating to the lending, collection and management of the funds exclusively to the council (ll. 10–12).¹¹¹ An amendment on the part of the recipient can also be seen in the endowments of Eumenes II and Attalos II to the city of Delphi: thus, the city of Delphi resolves that the money sent by Eumenes II and Attalos II would be sacred to Apollo (cat. no. 21C ll. 13f. and 22 l. 13);¹¹² this decision does not alter the act of donation or the way in which the city handles the money,¹¹³ but it does offer considerable protection against possible violation.¹¹⁴ The family association established by Epikteta also appears to have modified her original intent by making an interesting addition consonant to the aims of the group: the text of Epikteta's testament provides that the association, created by virtue of the testament, will receive annually from Epiteleia and her descendants the interest from the fund of 3,000 drachmas, that is, 210 drachmas (cat. no. 31ii ll. 61–64),¹¹⁵ while in its decree, the association decides that members assuming the *epimenieia* for the first time shall contribute to the expenses of the *symposion* (iii ll. 134–141) and that the income thus saved shall be invested (iii ll. 146–153).

2.2. ADMINISTRATION OF THE ENDOWMENTS

As we have said, every gift, and in general every financial benefaction, creates administrative needs. In the endowments these relate to the perpetual service of the purpose and the steady investment of the money or property given or bequeathed for that purpose. The already existing recipient communities provide the necessary structures and create others as required.¹¹⁶ The newly-founded family associations (cat. nos. 31, 61, 74 and maybe the very fragmentary cat. no. 78) are entirely new mechanisms,¹¹⁷ which primarily ensure that the income from the endowment is channelled into the specified purpose and its realisation, and may also take part in the exploitation of the property so endowed.¹¹⁸

111 For the assembly of citizens, the council and the form of government in Korkyra, see Psoma 2022, 316–336.

112 Conversely, in the endowment of Alkesippos to the city of Delphi (cat. no 20), the dedication was decided on by the endower.

113 In the endowment of Attalos II, it is foreseen that any surplus funds are to be returned to the city (cat. no. 22 ll. 19–21). This, according to Rousset 2013, 131, reinforces the view that sacred funds were not distinguished from public money belonging to the city.

114 It is not simply by chance that the dedication to Apollo is followed by the provision that no one, whether *archon* or private individual, shall be able to misuse this money in any manner (cat. no. 22 ll. 13–15), while any violation automatically activates the mechanism prescribed for sacred funds (ll. 15f.). For the role of the divine in the protection of endowments as a whole, see 2.3.2.4.

115 The practice is clearly an example of *Rentenstiftung* (see 3.3).

116 The various parameters of the cities' involvement in the administration of endowments are presented in Harter-Uibopuu 2011, 119–139 and 2015, 177–204.

117 We have already noted the complex character of these cases, where the purpose of the endowment coincides with that of the association, while at the same time the association itself and its operation are part of the purpose of the endowment and vice-versa (cf. 1.4 with note 36).

118 In the family associations of Epikteta and Poseidonios, the endowed property remained under the control of the endower's descendants (cat. nos. 31, 74), although in the case of Poseidonios

2.2.1. ADMINISTRATION IN THE FRAMEWORK OF A CIVIC OR SACRED COMMUNITY

2.2.1.1. APPLICATION OF LAWS

Reference has already been made to cases where endowments were instituted as laws of the community (see 1.5.1 with note 66). The reverse is also true with city laws being referred to in a number of endowments, since the cities to which these endowments were offered based the regulation of practical aspects of these endowments' administration on existing laws (see 1.5.2). Thus, in the decree with which Miletos accepted the endowment of Eudemos for the education of its children (cat. no. 82), the city decided that, if the treasurers should fail to pay a salary to the instructors in the *gymnasion* and schoolmasters, the provisions of the market law would be implemented (ll. 61–64), while the *paidonomoi* were to register the new holiday established for the children each month, as required by the education law (ll. 78–80).¹¹⁹ The decree with which the city of Delphi accepted the endowment of Attalos II (cat. no. 22), provided that those who misused the funds should be punished by the *mastroi* (ll. 15–19); the *mastroi* were also responsible for recording any failure to perform the rites prescribed and funded by the endowment during the *Attaleia* as a theft of sacred money on the part of the commissioners (*epimeletai*), in accordance with the *mastrikos nomos* (ll. 50–53).¹²⁰ The city of Korkyra was required to hire the artists and conduct the *Dionysia* with the revenues from the endowment of Aristomenes and Psylla according to the *agonothesia* law and the *agonothetes* was further required to do whatever else was prescribed by that law (cat. no. 26 ll. 15–17, 20–23, 80f., 86f., 93–95). In the endowment of Kritolaos, Aigiale decided to determine the prizes for youths and men in the contest that will be dedicated to Aleximachos in accordance with the gymnasiarchic law (cat. no. 27 ll. 81–83). There are also cases where the cities regulate matters relating to endowments (and especially violations of them) by referring to the way in which similar cases were handled in another context.¹²¹

it was provided that the association together with the *epimenioi*, appointed by the association, should take over, if the priest, who should be the eldest in Poseidonios' line of male descendants, failed to achieve an income or he did not donate the revenues generated (ll. 27–30). In the association founded by Diomedon, the endowed land was managed by the freedman Libys and his descendants (cat. no. 61i ll. 11–14). For more details on the management of endowments run by family associations, cf. 2.2.2.

119 The education (*paidonomikos*) and gymnasiarchic laws are presumably those referred to without further specification in the decree of Teos concerning the endowment of Polythrous (Cassayre 2010a, 185–189 no. 31 ll. 27–30).

120 The same applies to any corresponding action by the *epimeletai* during the *Eumeneia* (cat. no. 21B ll. 2–5). For the *mastrikos nomos* and the *mastroi* in Delphi, see Fröhlich 2004, 181–192.

121 Thus, those borrowing from the Kritolaos endowment in Aigiale, in Amorgos, were to pay the interests to the council in the month of Apatourion, just as with the sacred funds, and if they failed to do so, the interest would be exigible, again as with the sacred funds (cat. no. 27 ll. 19, 30); they would be indebted for the capital, guaranteed by the sureties they had furnished, just as with the tribal funds, forever (ll. 19–21).

2.2.1.2. ROLE OF THE COUNCIL

In some cases our sources provide information about the important role played by the council in the administration of endowments. Aristomenes and Psylla in Korkyra (cat. no. 26) gave the city council *carte blanche* not only for the administration of the endowment, but also for setting the rules for its administration. The council was to elect a committee of three loan agents (ἐκδανεισταί), the most powerful financially (τοὺς δυνατωτάτους χρήμασιν) (ll. 8–10, 44–48), while the lending and overall management of the money was to be handled in accordance with the council's decisions (ll. 10–12).¹²² The council and the assembly of citizens would decide whether the festival was to be suspended because of war (ll. 17f., 82f.) and were to record officially any failure on the part of the *ekdaneistai* to carry out their duties (ll. 71f.; cf. Rubinstein 2018, 124). The *agonothetes* and the three money-handlers (οἱ χειρίζοντες τὸ ἀργύριον – maybe the same as the three loan agents = *ekdaneistai*) were to make their reports to the council (ll. 94–100).

The commission of the *prodikoi* of the council were charged with prosecuting violations of the terms of the endowment, setting the fines and bringing them to court through the *prostates* of the council.¹²³ In the endowment of Kritolaos for Aigiale in Amorgos (cat. no. 27), the council also played an active role: those who borrow from the capital fund are to pay the annual interest in the council (ll. 18f., 99, 108). Moreover, the council (together with the *logistai* and the *archon*) will be responsible for collecting the interest – plus a fine – from anyone who fails to pay (ll. 29–32),¹²⁴ withholding from the rents of the properties which they had mortgaged as surety for the loan the sum corresponding to the interest due (ll. 32–35). It was also responsible for recording as debtors any tenants – of the mortgaged properties – who did not pay their rent (ll. 37–39).¹²⁵ Finally, it was the council that, in a session together with the *archon* and the treasurers, would turn over the interest to the *epimeletai* as soon as it was paid (ll. 111f.). In Lampsakos, the council and the *strategoí* appointed the men who in the public bank would be charged with handling the capital, that is, making loans and collecting the interest which was intended for financing festivities during the *Asklepieia* (cat. no. 95 ll. 16f.).¹²⁶ The council (*syndrion*) also plays an important role in the endowment of Theopompos for the *gymnasion* in Eretria: the investment of the money is to be handled by the *probouloi* and the

122 Aristomenes must himself have been a member of the council (see 4.1) and therefore able to influence its proceedings and decisions. For the fact that in its decree the council transfers some responsibilities to the assembly (the final provision was that any other matters relating to the endowment should be settled by decisions of the council and the assembly of citizens, ll. 139–140), see above.

123 Cat. no. 26 ll. 113–118. Cf. Fröhlich 2004, 427.

124 For the *logistai*, see Fröhlich 2004, 77–101.

125 Fröhlich 2004, 84f.

126 Soteles' announcement of the endowment he was creating to cover the cost of the pyrrhic dance at Pagai was also made before the council (cat. no. 12 l. 28: [πα]λὸν [ἐν] τῷ [συ]νεδρίῳ), as was also his promise to shoulder the cost of the creation and erection of the monument with which the city decided to honour him (ll. 31f.). He was probably member of this same council (Gauthier 2000a, 56f.).